

# AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

---

---

JUNE 24, 1939

## WHO'S WHO

THOMAS F. MEEHAN, who honors us by being a member of our editorial staff, is as alert and as modern as he was fifty years ago when the first idea of a Catholic Press Association was discussed. He and Doctor Hart, of Cincinnati, are undisputed leaders and pioneers in the field of Catholic journalism. With Monsignor Lavelle, rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, for fifty years, Mr. Meehan can affirm that he has conversed with all the six Archbishops of New York. He is as actively concerned about the Catholic Press Convention being currently held as he was about the meeting in 1889. . . . FARRELL SCHNERING entered the arena of the Catholic press about January of this year. He was a Communist, a leader of the comrades in Wisconsin, an editor of the *Red Voice of Labor*, and a disciple of Marx. He has cast them all off and is a follower of Christ. His occupation, now, is that of exposing the strategy and aims of the Moscowites and their American burrowers. . . . JOHN LAFARGE, as Associate Editor, is our authority on ideologies as they affect government and society. . . . E. L. CHICANOT is a journalist of Montreal. He came to Canada from England some thirty years ago, and has lived in various parts of the Dominion and has studied experimentally the social and economic questions. His latest interests have been in publications devoted to medical-economics. . . . HUGH F. SMITH, professor of English literature at the Milford Novitiate, Ohio, instigates a very enlightening bit of research for Wordsworthians.

## THIS WEEK

COMMENT .....	242
GENERAL ARTICLES	
The Press Association Harks Back a Half Century.....Thomas F. Meehan	244
Litvinov Gets Lemons After Plucking Plums for Stalin .....	Farrell Schnering 246
Discipline Not Arms Forms Our Strongest Defense .....	John LaFarge 248
Canadian Doctors Plan for Medical Insurance	E. L. Chicanot 250
EDITORIALS .....	252
Clear-Headed Vision . . . Non-Catholics Recognize	
. . . Catholics Conclude . . . Union Yet Freedom in	
the Catholic Press . . . Twelve Years, Too Much	
. . . The Carry Clause . . . The Call of the King.	
CHRONICLE .....	255
CORRESPONDENCE .....	257
LITERATURE AND ARTS	
Be Wary of Wordsworth's Sestet to "The Virgin"	
Hugh F. Smith	259
BOOKS .....	REVIEWED BY 261
The Prince Imperial.....John J. O'Connor	
The James.....Paul L. O'Connor	
A Personalist Manifesto.....William J. Benn	
ART .....	Harry Lorin Binsse 263
THEATRE .....	Elizabeth Jordan 263
FILMS .....	Thomas J. Fitzmorris 264
EVENTS .....	The Parader 264

---

---

*Editor-in-Chief:* FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

*Associate Editors:* PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,  
JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

*Editorial Office:* 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

*Business Manager:* STEPHEN J. MEANY.

*Business Office:* 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., June 24, 1939, Vol. LXI, No. 11, Whole No. 1550. Telephone Barclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Foreign, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

# COMMENT

---

---

AN APPEAL is hereby made to the Bishops of the United States that they reserve to themselves, in the most strict manner, the use of the name "Catholic" in the title of committees, organizations and publications. The unauthorized use of the term "Catholic" by minority groups of Catholics who are actually in opposition to the general sense and intent of Catholicism in this country has been embarrassing and misleading. It has led to confusion and disunity. The Bishops have the right to safeguard the name "Catholic," and to forbid the use of the name to any and every group, unless that group is fully in accord with the Catholic Church and its stand on current problems. It is not sufficient that the members of such groups be Catholic to empower them to express the Catholic view. Corporately, they must be recognized as Catholic by their Bishop.

— — —

A STATE that permits crime to go unpunished cannot long endure. About the wisdom or even the morality of capital punishment there may be among men a difference of opinion, but that the state must impose and enforce some adequate sanction for its laws, which in many cases are only statements of the natural law, is admitted by everybody. Thus, when a man is guilty of murder or rape, no one questions the right and duty of the civil authority to punish the criminal in accord with the law of the state. On the contrary, as citizens who must be protected in our rights to life and property we applaud the prompt and honest execution of justice. *Why*, then, this slanderous campaign against the executions in Spain? It has been estimated that more than 150,000 non-combatants, men, women and children were murdered during the course of the civil war in the territory controlled by the Leftist Government. In many of these slayings, death was preceded by rape and torture and was followed by robbery. The fiends who committed these outrages deserve death by every standard of civilized law. In no country in the world would they be pardoned and permitted to mingle with the friends and relatives of their victims. To attempt, therefore, to force General Franco by all the devices of lying propaganda to grant a general amnesty is as dishonest as it is contemptible. Strangely enough, the same groups and newspapers who ignored the wholesale slaughter and rape of innocent people in Red Spain are the very ones who are now crying hypocritically to heaven because murderers are being executed for their crimes!

— — —

KATERI was born in the vicinity of Auriesville, N. Y., in 1656. There is a shrine there, now, to the

North American Martyrs and, as far as is permitted, to her. She died at Caughnawaga, near Montreal, Canada, in 1680. In the church of this Indian village, her bones are piously preserved and reverently are shown to pilgrims. Her father was an Iroquois of the Turtle clan; her mother was a Christian Algonquin. She was known as Tekakwitha. When she was about eleven years of age, she learned of Jesus and Mary from the Jesuit missionaries who came to her village for a few days. When she had reached the age of eighteen, she asked for Baptism from the Iroquois missionary, Jacques de Lamberville. She maintained virginity as a supernatural virtue in the midst of savage promiscuity. She practised mortifications of an extraordinary kind, through love of God, and devoted herself to prayer and meditation in such manner that God shed on her exceptional favors. While she lived, and immediately after her death, she was revered as a holy one of God by the Indians and by the priests who knew her soul. Now, the Cardinals of the Congregation of Rites in Rome, having studied the life of Kateri exhaustively, declared unanimously that the cause of this twenty-four-year-old Indian maiden was worthy of further investigation. They communicated their decision to His Holiness, Pius XII. And he, in turn, has given his approval. Thus, Kateri, the Lily of the Mohawks, in God's good time, may be declared Venerable, then Blessed, then Saint. The tremendous work of documentation and promotion of the cause of Kateri was completed by the Vice-Postulator, John J. Wynne, S.J. His labors and his love have prepared the way. Our prayers may be added, now that the Holy Father may acclaim Kateri among the sainted virgins of the Church.

— — —

ORGANIZED labor cannot hope to make further progress in this country without the support of public opinion. For many years the mass of our people sympathized with the efforts of the worker to secure justice from the employer by organization and collective bargaining. If we analyze the causes of this favorable attitude toward unionism, we shall find that in almost every case the injustice of the employer group and the use of illegal and socially irresponsible methods were contributing factors. As labor achieves power, there is a temptation to commit the same follies. Recently, for instance, at Flint, Mich., the public was treated to the unedifying spectacle of a mass fist fight between the C.I.O.'s U.A.W.U. and the rival A. F. of L. union headed by Homer Martin. The fight occurred when the non-striking C.I.O. men went through the picket line established by the A. F. of L. at the Fisher Body Plant No. 1. On the same day, at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company in West



Allis, Wis., the newspapers reported that pickets threw stones, attacked street cars, and otherwise resorted to strong-arm methods. If the splendid achievement of organized labor in this country is not to be jeopardized by a loss of public confidence and good will, labor leaders must forego all recourse to violent and illegal means. The public, as certain industrialists have learned by bitter experience, will not agree to be damned.

— — —

SPANISH mothers are still besieging the offices of their Government for word about their lost children. Snatched from their mothers' arms by an infamous government, these children were scattered over the countries of Europe and even to the shores of America without trace of their origin. These mothers are demanding of the Nationalist Government, now the war is over and diplomatic relations have been established with all reputable nations, that their children be returned to them. Representations on the part of the Franco Government have met with unwarranted opposition from the countries where the children are sequestered. The result has been rightful indignation and bitterness in the Spanish press toward the countries where the practice of instigating adoption of these kidnaped children is making increasing headway. Even in our own country, which prides itself on its fairness and respect for the rights of other nations, such organizations as the Foster Parents' Plan for Children in Spain and the Spanish Child Welfare Association are permitted under the very nose of our Government to incite American citizens "to adopt Spanish children and prevent their return to Spain." It is small wonder that the Spanish press cannot conceive how the United States Government can "tolerate such an infamous exploitation of Spanish children." By every right Spain, an accredited Government, demands the return of these children. They are her citizens, forcibly removed from their native land, over whom she exercises legitimate control inasmuch as they are minors, dependent upon their parents residing in Spain. It is such injustice at the hands of the so-called democracies that will drive Spain into the Rome-Berlin axis.

— — —

ARGUMENTS offered by the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the Catholic Hospital Association, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Protestant Hospital Association, the American Hospital Association and other medically and socially interested groups, are conclusive. The arguments were presented against the Wagner National Health Bill (S1620) to the Senate sub-committee. The agencies listed in opposition to the bill should rather overwhelm the few supposedly Catholic dissidents who have declared in favor of the Wagner bill. These responsible Catholic, Protestant and medical agencies, in summary, state "their belief that the Wagner bill would make impossible cooperation between governmental and non-governmental agencies for the care of the sick; their grave fear that the measure actually threatens the

continued existence of the non-governmental agencies; their amazement and concern that, despite assurances previously given by high Government officials, the Wagner bill, as drawn, ignores the voluntary and church hospitals of the United States." For many reasons, this Review looks upon the Wagner bill with the gravest suspicion. Through it, the medical profession is brought under the thumb of the Federal officials in Washington. By it, the process of Federal centralization, bureaucracy and dictatorship is advanced. The care of the health of the citizen is made a political function. An alternative is offered on page 250. The example of Canada may lead our doctors out of the morass. But can it possibly keep our socialist-minded theorists from interfering in private enterprise? And will a good plan satisfy our Washington bureaucrats?

— — —

A DISTRESSING statement was made by Alfred H. Cope, agent for the American Friends Service Committee for Spain, upon his return last week to the United States. Mr. Cope was in charge of the Quaker relief work at Murcia, in the Loyalist area, for about a year. He declared that, after the recovery of Valencia by the Nationalists, several shiploads of food, contributed by American and European agencies specifically for the feeding of children under three years of age, had been diverted by the Franco authorities, and had been consumed by the army and other civilians. The general charges made by Mr. Cope to the newspaper reporters were reaffirmed by him in a personal interview. He was asked for specific details about these seizures, the dates, places, amounts and kinds of food, etc. He was unable to supply such necessary data, but referred to the protest he alleged the Quakers' agent in Paris had sent to General Franco. A copy of this is now being demanded. Meanwhile, Juan de Cárdenas, Spanish Ambassador to Washington, after communicating with the authorities in Burgos, and after being assured that the charges were false, has issued a denial of them. After talking to Mr. Cope, we concluded that there might possibly have been some seizures of food by military or civil authorities here or there; that such incidents were almost inevitable in the disorganized conditions immediately following the capture of enemy territory; that, in an acute food shortage such as existed in the Valencia area, the local authorities may have been consulting the critical needs of society as a whole, and may have acted hastily. But we deny, emphatically, having made investigations, that the Franco regime can justly be stigmatized as a regime which steals or confiscates foreign foodstuffs intended for babies, and gorges its soldiers with condensed milk. The allegations to the press made by Mr. Cope were unfortunate and exceeded the facts of his exact knowledge. They were seized upon unfairly by the malicious enemies of General Franco. And as usual, the *New York Times* and some few other papers, waiting always to pounce upon Franco, published nasty editorials in what can be interpreted only as a spirit of mean vindictiveness.

# THE PRESS ASSOCIATION HARKS BACK A HALF CENTURY

Recollections of one of the earliest progenitors

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

---

---

---

DETAILS of the annual meeting of the Catholic Press Association of the United States, which is being held at the Hotel Commodore, New York, June 22-24, include: a Solemn Pontifical Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral at which Archbishop Spellman, a former editor of the *Boston Pilot*, presides, and Bishop Gannon, chairman of the Press Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, preaches; the editorial and business sessions of the several departments of the Association; a dinner at the Columbus Club, Brooklyn, given by the *Tablet*, on the evening of June 23; the election of officers, on the following day; and then the grand windup by a visit to and dinner at the World's Fair, at which the delegates can marvel at the wonders of the World of Today and dream of the wonders they will evolve for the Catholic press in the World of Tomorrow.

In all their announced program of preparation, those in charge seem to have forgotten that this is the golden jubilee year of the project of a national Catholic press organization. When, in connection with the celebration of the establishment of the Hierarchy of the United States, the first Catholic Congress met in Baltimore, November 11 and 12, 1889, one of the features of the gathering was a meeting of editors of the Catholic press, held on Sunday, November 19, in the Hotel Rennert, with the idea of bringing about such an association.

Twenty-five editors, representing fifteen different States, attended. Looking over the recorded list of the participants, only my old friend, Dr. Thomas P. Hart, emeritus editor of the *Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph-Register*, and myself survive to tell the tale. To be candid, I do not remember any of the particular details of what was done, nor does Doctor Hart, as he confessed in a note some time ago. Father F. W. Graham of the *Catholic Tribune* of St. Joseph, Mo., presided. There must have been the usual amount of convention oratory which, sad to say, is lost for posterity, but which resulted in a determination to hold a general convention of Catholic press representatives in Cincinnati on the first Wednesday of May, 1890. This was held and then and there the Catholic Press Association of America was founded.

One of these "founding fathers" was Daniel A.

Rudd, editor of the *Colored Catholic* of Cincinnati, and one of the Committee on Organization that issued the official call for the Baltimore Congress. He was then, and all during his active life, recognized as a national figure in Catholic lay action, and there was never any special reference to his color. The interracial issue had not yet forced itself into the acute social problem field.

There is no occasion here to recite the proceedings of the various annual conventions that followed. The Association was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1911, in spite of remonstrances on the part of some of the members who did not see that the incorporation would be of any value, especially as it cost \$77.60. There were then fifty-two paying members at \$10 each. The time of most of the annual meetings was taken up in discussing how to increase the machinery for a more satisfactory gathering of news; how to get advertising and how to wake up the inert public interest in the practical support of Catholic papers.

The organization thus jogged along with indifferent success until the World War began and with it the National Catholic Welfare Council of the Hierarchy of the United States, of which the Rev. John J. Burke, C.S.P., became the General Secretary. One day AMERICA's telephone rang and answering it I was told it was Father John Burke speaking. The subsequent conversation disclosed that the Council had determined it needed a publication to state its opinions and programs, and he wanted names suggested for someone to take charge of such a publicity organ. Father Tierney was then editor of AMERICA and after going over the field, at his suggestion, I sent Father Burke the names of Michael Williams, Elmer Murphy and John Bunker.

Mr. Williams, with the necessary staff of assistants, was made the editor of the publication which was called the *National Catholic Welfare Council Bulletin*. The name of the Council later was changed to Conference, for canonical reasons, and the *Bulletin* became *Catholic Action*, as it is now known. Until 1919 the *Bulletin* came out monthly; then, following the recommendation of the Pastoral of the Bishops issued after their annual conference of September, 1919, the Press De-



partment News Service of the National Council was started on April 11, 1921, and Justin McGrath, a newspaperman of wide and brilliant service in the secular ranks of journalism, was put in charge of its operation.

The Catholic Press Association accepted the service as an effective agency for improving the unsatisfactory conditions that then, through no fault of theirs, prevailed, and which they of themselves were not able to cure. In this connection with the Welfare Council Bureau they retained the individual independence of their national association. Under Mr. McGrath's direction, and that of his successor, Mr. Frank A. Hall, the News Bureau has been a great success and its trend has been to revolutionize the whole tenor and status of the Catholic weekly press and develop and standardize its potential possibilities in meeting what the Bishops, in their Pastoral of 1919, described as the exigencies of its mission: "To correct false or misleading statements regarding our belief and practice and, as occasion offers, to present our doctrine in popular form."

No better testimony to the fruitful results of the successful efforts of this new combination can be offered than the showing made at the World Catholic Press Exhibition held in the Cortile della Pigna, Vatican City, from April to October, 1936. The Catholic papers in the United States developed, from the six that existed in 1840 to the 134, circulation 2,396,516, now served by the N. C. W. C. News Bureau; and the magazines increased, from two to 197, circulation 4,604,141. In this first worldwide review of Catholic life as expressed and represented by the Catholic press it elicited the warmest commendation as doing honor to the activity that Catholics in the United States manifested in the field of journalism and the evolution from the style and contents of Bishop England's *United States Catholic Miscellany* of 1823.

Only three of our pioneer journals now remain: the Cincinnati *Catholic Telegraph* begun in 1831; the Boston *Pilot*, founded by Patrick Donahoe in 1836; and the Pittsburgh *Catholic*, 1844. Last March, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce by a survey found that there were forty-two business concerns in the city that were a century old. Among these was the *Telegraph*, the only local paper so distinguished, and the Chamber, on March 23, presented it with a bronze plaque on which was this inscription: "The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce takes the occasion of its one hundredth anniversary to pay special tribute to the *Catholic Telegraph-Review*, founded in 1831, which for more than one hundred years, by exemplifying that which is best in the tradition of private enterprise, has been a continuing force in making Cincinnati a distinctive American city. 1939."

In September, 1937, the Archbishop of Cincinnati took over the ownership of the *Telegraph* from the venerable Dr. Thomas P. Hart, and made it a diocesan property and the local link in the chain of diocesan editions of the Denver *Register*, a move that has put new pith and vigor into the centenarian relic of the foundation era. This Denver

*Register* chain is one of the marvelous results of the progress and development of our modern Catholic press. Its editor, founder and manager is Msgr. Matthew Smith, the legend of whose career is that he began in his youth as a practical newsman in Altoona, Pa., but was forced by ill health to go out to Denver, where, after a while he recuperated sufficiently to enter a seminary and, making the usual course, was ordained priest. In addition to his sacerdotal duties he returned to his old love and took up the direction of the *Register* which was an indifferent, struggling weekly. His virile writing, enterprise and novelty in promoting its circulation soon changed its character and established its reputation as an interesting, well arranged, newsy paper, special editions of which he gradually persuaded the Ordinaries of other dioceses to accept for local distribution.

This lengthening of his chain papers has steadily gone on until he now issues local editions for twenty-two dioceses and has a circulation of several hundred thousand. He certainly has shown how success can be accomplished in modern press ways and methods if the directing head has practical technical skill as well as literary ability, and knows how to apply it. Of course a little executive acumen is not an addition to be despised. As results are what count in the final analysis, Msgr. Smith's *Register* seems to call for a pretty high rating.

There have been so far three national conventions held in New York. The first was in Archbishop Corrigan's administration when a somewhat stormy episode over some of the rumblings of discord as to politics and policies echoed in the index. The second was in August, 1916, when the delegates were treated to a really good time as the delegates this year also will have. They had, of course, the usual business sessions, then after a lunch at the Catholic Club they were taken in buses to Coney Island where the famous Captain Paul Boyton, one of the founders of that world-renowned resort, had all its attractions put at the command of the delegates. They neglected none of them, had an elaborate shore dinner and wound up a long, long day by attending the one o'clock morning Mass at the Shrine Church of Our Lady of Solace which is said every Sunday during the season for the playground's many night workers. Even after the ceremony, I remember, it was then difficult to persuade many delegates to return to Manhattan.

The third New York convention was in May, 1928, and was held at the Knights of Columbus Hotel. At the public meeting, Cardinal Hayes presided. Charles H. Ridder of the *Catholic News* was the chairman of the local reception committee for this convention, and now for New York's fourth effort he presides over all its incidents.

The delegates during the Convention will be the guests of the Brooklyn *Tablet* whose business manager, Claude M. Becker has, on its part, assumed all expenses at the Hotel Commodore, the dinners, and the trip to the World's Fair. In this he has associated with himself the editors of the local Catholic papers, and they have served with him on the committees acting.

# LITVINOV GETS LEMONS AFTER PLUCKING STALIN'S PLUMS

The prospects for a Nazi-Communist combine

FARRELL SCHNERING

---

---

---

WITH the removal of Maxim Litvinov another great Soviet Machiavelli has been cast upon the mountainous scrap heap of Bolshevism. Kremlin spokesmen assert "Papasha" (Dear Papa), as he was nicknamed by Lenin, resigned; but never before has anyone heard of a Bolshevik resigning so long as he was useful to the Party. Liquidation is the common and more popular Stalinist technique.

Litvinov attended the conference at which Lenin formed the Bolshevik Party and since that time has never been known to veer from the "Leninist line." In the art of Bolshevik black magic he has ranked second only to Comrade Stalin. Lenin felt that in Litvinov he had found a born diplomat, a master conspirator and sound businessman. His early activities in the Party were as a kind of business manager, whose special tasks were to keep open the underground channels between Russia and the rest of Europe, and to raise funds.

Litvinov went into the business of smuggling in order to supply arms for the Russian revolution of 1905, and profited handsomely thereby. To obtain money for the Cause, Stalin robbed a bank in Tiflis. It was Litvinov, operating in Paris, who changed that money into smaller denominations and circulated it back to the Marxian thieves. But the Parisian authorities caught up with him. He finally had to flee to London.

In London, "Papasha" served the Party, but his principal interest was in himself. He lived very well and traveled in bourgeois circles, for there has never been anything proletarian about his personal tastes, excepting for show purposes in Moscow. He met, wooed and married Ivy Low, niece of a one-time Lord Mayor and daughter of Sir Edward Low. As a result of this marriage, certain Bolsheviks for a time were suspicious of Litvinov because of his wife's bourgeois antecedents. But there was no suspicion from the *Politburo*.

Shortly after the Bolsheviks seized power, Litvinov was thrown into a British prison as a dangerous revolutionary. Over in Moscow, Lenin fell to thinking about his qualifications and decided he was too valuable to languish in jail. That well-known Britisher, Charles Lockhart, was being held prisoner by the Reds. Lenin made a trade and Litvinov returned to his native land. He drew a

place in the foreign service under Chicherin, his masters reckoning that his business acumen would make him a successful salesman for Bolshevism in the world at large. In 1929, he became Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

He inherited the rather tremendous task of breaking the isolation of the Stalin regime. He began as a puling pacifist, making speeches abroad about complete disarmament; while back home Stalin was building a huge war machine. The lords of the Kremlin turned hopeful eyes toward Czechoslovakia, and Litvinov, the Red Fox, delivered. In Prague, there hung "Welcome" signs for the masters of the dialectic. Publications of the Comintern were printed in that city, the copy being sent over from Moscow. At times the Comintern had to hold meetings the purpose of which was obviously foreign meddling in the interest of Moscow. Since it was deemed imprudent to hold them in the Bolshevik capital, the boys journeyed to Prague. And the hearts of the old revolutionaries were filled with gratitude to Maxim who had provided an arena in which their puppets could be manipulated by strings extending from Moscow.

"Dear Papa" traveled to London and Washington, D. C. He came seeking recognition for the Red Fatherland and bearing apocryphal tales concerning the activities of the Comintern. And after him there came a greater and more effective flow of propaganda. His greatest contribution to Bolshevism was made when he brought Russia into the League of Nations and pressed that body into the service of Stalin as a means of breaking Soviet isolation. Then the Red Fox set out to victimize France. This he did in the consummation of the Franco-Soviet pact, thus helping much to put France on the road to Marxian benevolence through the *Front Populaire*.

Deals made by Litvinov contributed to the outbreak of the awful civil war in Spain. His program of "collective security," to aid poor Comrade Stalin by force of arms, became a widely popular slogan. Unfortunately, it has a counterpart too prevalent in Washington in the nonsense about "quarantining the aggressor," so dear to Earl Browder.

And then came Munich, where Litvinov struck a snag. As a result, Stalin was again stricken with



the fear of isolation, for the "peace at Munich" made isolation a terrible reality. Since Munich, there have been rumors of Soviet *rapprochement* toward Germany. Stalin's conciliatory speech at the recent Russian Party's congress indicated a soulful wooing of the Fuehrer. Litvinov's "resignation" again portends that. However, Comintern spokesmen still blather about democratic alliances against Fascism.

Now if Stalin still clings to the latter plan, Litvinov is better fitted for the job than any other Russian, particularly for a British deal. He has been a keen student of British politics and diplomacy and has often been called the Soviet Austin Chamberlain. One can not imagine the peasant-bred Molotov being as successful with England as the polished Litvinov. But on the other hand, the appointment of Molotov seems to be consistent with Stalin's tendency toward casting off the intellectuals, surrounding himself with those steeped in peasant tradition, who seem to fit in more readily with his native duplicity.

If the Kremlin is angling for German *rapprochement*, Litvinov is the last Russian who could bring that about. For "Papasha" is a Jew, which makes him an untouchable for the Nazi.

Germany's animosity toward France is great; neither does the attitude of Daladier warm the cockles of Comrade Stalin's heart. And Hitler has designs upon the Ukraine. Supposing that crafty Bolsheviks suggest Hitler make demands upon Alsace-Lorraine, once German territory, with its deposits of iron and coal? Russia might agree to sit idly by and ignore this move, if in lieu of Alsace Hitler would lay off the Ukraine. France's plight in that case would draw no tears from Stalin, but would rather bring him peace of mind. It is a fact that Stalin is now cool to British advances toward Moscow. Perhaps this bodes ill for France.

Litvinov may be the man who knows just what Stalin's designs are, which could mean that he knows too much. Or, as a Jew, he may frown upon a German deal and might attempt to block it. And if that be true, what if "Dear Papa" should kick over the traces and talk too much? Such a condition could well necessitate his "resignation."

In connection with the rumor of a Hitler-Stalin agreement, many people, particularly Kremlin innocents abroad, cry out: "Impossible! Look at Hitler's anti-Semitism." Those who reason so must reconsider the flexibility of Stalin's doctrine. Dialectical processes could recast Hitler as the savior of Jewry. The Fuehrer frequently calls his enemies "greasy Jews," and "half-nigger hybrids." But long before Hitler, Marx and Engels applied similar epithets to their opponents.

Marx came to grips with La Salle, a German Jew who rivaled him as a leader and theoretician of German radicalism. Marx coined an opprobrious title for his rival—"the Jewish nigger"—and justified that term in a letter to Engels:

... the shape of his head and growth of his hair indicate he is descended from the Negroes who joined in the flight of Moses from Egypt (unless his mother or grandmother, on the father's side

crossed with a nigger). This union of Jew and German on a Negro basis was bound to produce an extraordinary hybrid. The importunity of the fellow is also negroid.

Engels replied to Marx regarding La Salle:

He was always . . . a true Jew of the Slavonic border . . . out to exploit someone for his own ends. This thirst to push his way into polite society to smear over the dirty Breslau Jew with grease and paint, was always revolting.

Communists loudly denounce Hitler's partition of Czecho-Slovakia, but if Stalin should tacitly acquiesce in the Fuehrer's domination there, they would only have to go back to Engels for a justification. Hegel held that the Southern and Western Slavs were the "last dregs of barbarism." But Engel's contempt was greater than his teacher's. He would allow the Czechs no function save that of disappearance. Hitler in his dream of *Mittel-europa* seems to carry on where Engels left off.

Bakunin, Russian revolutionist who became the most formidable rival of Marx and Engels, advocated a "democratic national and social revolution" to free the Czechs from the Hapsburgs. Engels contended this was absurd since it would "cut Germany off from the Adriatic in order to patch up an independent state from the 'rags and tatters' of the southern Slavs." He opposed self-determination and favored Germany's control of the Czechs. On July 4, 1866, he wrote Marx on the Austro-Prussian conflict and deplored the separation of Austria, expressing hope that it would soon be united with Germany. He feared an "increase of Slavism in Bohemia."

In general, Stalin's attitude seems to conform with Marx's prediction and estimate of Russian behavior. He detested everything Russian and the very word called up his wrath. Marx declared the word "honor" was not contained in the Russian vocabulary (Hitler makes about the same charge). He fought their admission to the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association. Engels also shared his friend's hatred and in a letter declared: "They (the Russian radicals) worm their way among workers everywhere, insinuate themselves into leading positions and bring their private intrigues and brawls which are unavoidable among Russians."

At no time would Marx or Engels place trust in the Russian radicals and the behavior of the Kremlin Machiavellis seems to establish that their suspicions would be a good rule for all people to be guided by today.

Litvinov's removal, like other Stalinist moves, is another many-sided question which, on the surface, seems mystifying. Perhaps it will be years before history will clarify the full meaning of that peculiar technique called the Bolshevik purge. But another head seems about to roll in the bloody sands of Stalinism and now Russia's most successful diplomat appears headed for the destiny of Bukharin, Rykov and others. In this case we might not be too far from wrong if we say: Stalin's United-Front plums, purveyed by Litvinov, have become very sour lemons for "Dear Papa." Such are the luscious fruits of Bolshevism.

LIE.  
MARX  
WAS  
A  
JEW.

# DISCIPLINE NOT ARMS FORMS OUR STRONGEST DEFENSE

Laymen, too, need the lesson of the Counsels

JOHN LaFARGE, S.J.

---

---

---

ON St. Clement's Island, in the Potomac River, a group of some thousand people gathered on Memorial Day to commemorate the first coming of religion to those parts at the founding of the Maryland Colony; and to honor the centennial anniversary of a body of consecrated Brothers whose disciplined lives are devoted to the cause of Christian education.

More than three centuries have passed over that little island and the surrounding shores without ever troubling them by war. The sole exception might have been a flurry caused by a small British expedition up the Potomac in the War of 1812. Guns at Bull Run were heard at St. Clement's Island, but if any fighting ever came nearer, there has been little record of it.

The people who heard Mass that day in the open were not concerned about war. Nothing seemed more fantastic than the thought that events taking place four thousand miles away across the ocean and half of Europe could affect a place so remote and isolated as St. Clement's. But at Washington, only a few dozen miles to the northward, people thought differently, and millions were appropriated to build ships, planes and fortifications lest war should come from abroad to the shores of the Potomac River.

Those who advocate this expenditure claim that mere isolation is not protection, not for the Potomac, not for any part of our country. The peace of the world is being threatened by totalist powers, and we must wield force to meet their force.

Opinions differ sharply as to the reality of such physical danger; hence, as to the need of such enormous expense. With that question left to experts, the most vital matter of all seems to be overlooked.

We do not need to go far back in history to learn that a nation's strongest defense needs not only weapons but also moral discipline. Striking instance of that was given in the recent Nationalist victories in Spain, where the tremendous material equipment of the Loyalist forces crumbled when the Loyalist morale broke down, and dissension and quarreling took the place of a precarious unity.

If we are really worried about the totalists it is time we give thought to a weapon which they are

polishing up, the weapon of moral discipline, which gives power to armies, diplomacy and propaganda. We once possessed it, we have not fully lost it as yet, but we have allowed it wofully to rust in our hands.

Moral discipline, in the sense that I mean it here, in itself is neither virtue nor vice. Saint Michael and Satan can each make use of it for their respective followers. But neither Saint Michael nor Satan can dispense with it.

When Abraham Lincoln, in the person of Raymond Massey, makes his affecting departure speech at Springfield from the platform of an Illinois Central coach, he doubts whether democracy, as he has known it, can continue in this world. If that fails which America has tried to accomplish, says Lincoln, then the experiment will not be repeated.

The democracy which Lincoln knew had been successful in its own crude way. In a frontier country it solved certain essential problems of government. Laws were made and interpreted, criminals were judged and punished, equity was administered. The Catholic missionaries who pioneered in Kentucky and Illinois found that religion flourished under a frontier democracy. Churches were built, schools and colleges founded, parishes organized, and souls were saved wherever the priest or the Catholic teacher could make his way.

Discipline was found in that early democracy because of certain elements in the people's lives which were analogous to elements in the lives of the priests and Religious who found a home in the frontier: elements of poverty, of chastity, of obedience, of penance and sacrifice, though from other motives and in a different order of conduct.

It was a mere analogy, for the pioneers were far from being over-concerned with the Saviour's counsels of perfection. Avarice, impurity, drunkenness and lawlessness were found in plenty among them. Their religion, save in the Catholic settlements, was emotional and for the most part devoid of doctrine. But there was enough Christian tradition left among them to give life to a certain elementary discipline. They lived mostly by personal labor, not by mere titles to the labor of others. Their life obliged them to help one another and sacrifice



purely personal gain to the good of the community. There was enough religion to impart a certain sense of fellowship. They were obliged to toil hard and to toil together. They had to look to the integrity of their families and to make their homes self-sustaining, even though the family was housed for months at a time in a covered wagon. They were constrained to suffer and to pay with suffering for any privileges which the new country yielded.

Their strongest protection against enemies at home and potential enemies abroad was neither their isolation nor their ability to handle firearms. While both of these things helped, their principal safeguard was that hardy discipline which tradition and circumstances forced upon them.

We have lost the tradition, the circumstances have changed; and with it all we are fast losing that particular protection.

Youth today in the totalist countries is brought up under a discipline which in many ways resembles that of the frontier. Circumstances have imposed it: isolation and the corresponding need of self-sufficiency. Governmental atheism has built a wall around Russia, and Russian youth are obliged to root and dig if they are to stay alive. Italy and Germany are dedicated to autarchy. Self-sufficiency in all these countries is to be obtained by hard work and serious sacrifice. Young men's energy, which in this country goes into athletics, in Germany is spaded into the soil, in order that vegetables may grow and the nation live.

Our countryside is dotted with public high schools, upon which millions are spent for architecture, equipment and recreational facilities. We point to these with pride; they are the apple of our democratic eye. Our youth are trained in these schools to seek and to seize opportunity. But for the most part the opportunity they are trained to seize is opportunity to get away from work, to succeed, to make good in the great world. It is not opportunity to contribute personal labor to the community or the nation, for the benefit of their present or future families. While their lives may be individually blameless, their concept of opportunity is based upon no sound Christian philosophy of life. In consequence, their education is not an education to discipline.

Immense energy is expended at present in this country in political campaigns against Fascism and Communism, campaigns which readily appeal to the masses and stir up popular sentiment. Where Fascism and Communism operate in the political field, as, for instance, in certain phases of our Federal and municipal governments, political manifestations have to be met politically. If Communist or Fascist politicians are elected or appointed to office, anti-Communist and anti-Fascist votes have to put out the elected officials or the officials who appointed them; and that cannot be done without a political campaign. But such campaigns suffice only to hinder the evil manifestations and the scandal or harm these manifestations create; they cannot cure the disease. The disease is not a political but a social malady which has its roots in irreligion. De-

stroy all the Communistic or Fascistic leaders in the country, with the United States army or any other way, and the disease will again send forth its sprouts.

Nor can the evil be cured merely by discipline for discipline's sake. To attempt that and try to regiment our youth in totalist style, would merely lay us open to the disasters which are bound in the end to attend the totalist experiments, built as they are upon propaganda and appeals to the empty gods of national pride, class and race hatreds. If we are to keep what discipline we have, and create the discipline we need and lack, it must grow from within, and none can make it grow in America today but the Catholic Church.

This places Catholics in the extremely difficult position of possessing the only effective key to the problem of discipline in the America of today. Since discipline is more powerful than armies or airplanes or fortifications, more powerful even than the modern titan of organized propaganda, since discipline has the final say in public affairs, it means that we possess the secret of the most powerful agency in the world for national defense. How can we teach that secret to our fellowmen?

There is a simple and effective way in which that secret of discipline can be taught. It is to lead lives like the Congregation of Saint Francis Xavier, those Brothers whose centenary we celebrated on St. Clement's Island. This does not mean that all our Catholic laymen should be vowed to celibacy like the Xaverian Brothers, but it does mean that they should bring into their lives, married or single as they may be, that same high zeal for personal purity which is the flaming wall God has placed around the paradise of the Christian home.

It does not mean that they own their goods in common through a vow of poverty, like the Xaverians, but it means that they follow the Brothers' example in treating all material goods as a gift and stewardship from God, for which an account is to be rendered on the last day.

Nor can our laymen place all the details of their individual lives in the hands of a Religious Superior, to whom they promise obedience. But it does mean that into our common life as Americans, into our social and economic life we can bring that spirit of self-sacrifice, of mutual aid, of reverence for duly constituted authority, of consideration for our fellow man based not upon the appearance which meets the eye but upon the truth known to us by the Catholic Faith, which is exemplified in the common life of a teaching Brother.

The Evangelical Counsels, we are taught, are for those who are called to them, as were the Apostles of old and the Brothers of today; that is to say, to their literal, integral fulfillment in the Religious state. But surely the Counsels, in a wider sense, are for all mankind; for America today needs as it never needed in its history the exemplification of poverty, chastity and obedience in the lives of its Catholic laymen. Here is a clue to that terrific problem of discipline. Here is the strongest defense for our shores, whether of the Potomac or of the nation.

# CANADIAN DOCTORS PLAN FOR MEDICAL INSURANCE

## Cooperation method is better than state control

E. L. CHICANOT

---

---

---

AS announced recently, the Medical Society of New Jersey has established a non-profit corporation to provide group medical service under an insurance system, with subscribers paying at the rate of about four cents a day. The president of the Society stated that the project was the first of its kind to be sponsored by a State medical society in the East, though similar plans had already been approved by the State medical organizations of California and Michigan.

What he did not say was that the plans adopted by the medical associations of these States were drawn up after a study of one which has been in operation in Canada for the past two years. The president went on to say that the plan will be conducted on an experimental basis for about a year to determine its feasibility. He might have added that the increasing success which has attended the Canadian plan since establishment is an excellent augury for United States' experience.

The situation with regard to the provision of medical care to the bulk of the population over the past decade or so would seem to have been very similar on both sides of the border. Difficulty on the part of middle-class families to pay medical bills became acute; agitation for some system of adequate medical care at reasonable cost grew widespread; the example of what European countries had done induced governments to take a hand. In Canada, a Dominion-wide health insurance scheme would seem to have been obviated merely through constitutional differences between Federal and Provincial governments, which it took the Privy Council to iron out—in favor of the Provinces. Two Provinces actually have health insurance acts on their statute books, though they have never been put into operation. Over a large section of the Prairie Provinces, physicians are employed by the municipalities, constituting the nearest approach to socialized medicine existing in North America.

Canadian doctors have gone through a trying time. They do not want socialized medicine. They regard with scarcely greater pleasure the prospect of health insurance under government control. They do not want the injection into the medical situation of any factor which might affect the existing and traditional doctor-patient relationship.

But, though fairly well organized, they have not been able to do much to stem the sweep of public and legislative opinion.

They did manage to halt the British Columbia health insurance scheme by refusing to act under it because, largely, it failed to make provision for certain classes of patients they were already treating free. But for the main part, they have appeared to be content to be carried along toward what they regarded as the ultimate inevitability of compulsory government health insurance. They merely enunciated certain principles, satisfactory to themselves, which they hoped would be incorporated in any health insurance scheme mooted or enacted.

Then an idea took shape in the mind of a Toronto physician, Dr. J. A. Hannah. Having had an ailing wife for some years, he could look at the medical picture with peculiar understanding from the angles of both doctor and patient. The public demanded some form of health insurance, and in all logic it was a reasonable demand. The only way to prevent the government's stepping in and giving it to them, compelling the doctors to work under the scheme, was for the doctors to establish an insurance scheme of their own and demonstrate it could be operated to the satisfaction of the public.

After extensive research, Dr. Hannah satisfied himself that for approximately twenty dollars a year the average individual could have complete medical service without any alteration in the tariff on which doctors in Ontario were operating. Upon this basis he drew up his scheme, which insurance actuaries investigated and approved. He got small groups of both the profession and laity interested in establishing the project. The Ontario Medical Association approved the principle of the scheme and even voted a subsidy of \$5,000 to cover the launching. With this approval a provincial charter was taken out and Associated Medical Services, Incorporated, came into being. The Ontario Government exhibited a keen interest in the aims of the scheme—partly, perhaps, because among the first subscribers were groups of civil servants—and provided the organization with office accommodation in the Parliament buildings.

The plan was necessarily voluntary in every respect, both from the public and the profession's



point of view. It was based on the conviction that the most efficient method of practice is relatively competitive and on a fee-for-service basis. Subscribers to the scheme were solicited upon an assurance of complete medical attention for the fee paid: \$2.00 per month for the first member of a family; \$1.75 for the second; \$1.25 for the third; and \$1.00 for each successive member. Thus, a family of husband and wife and two children paid \$84 a year. For this they were guaranteed: 1. the service of participating physicians in the home, office, or hospital, including consultations; 2. surgical procedures within the scope of a competent surgeon; 3. semi-private available accommodation, or a sum not to exceed \$3.50 a day toward the cost of hospitalization in an approved hospital; 4. all necessary nursing; 5. child birth when the subscriber had paid dues for ten consecutive months prior to confinement.

The scheme appealed as equally advantageous from the doctor's point of view. He stood to gain in a material sense without being asked to depart in the slightest from his traditional and cherished individualistic rôle. When an individual made application to subscribe to the Association, he was asked to name his family physician. Each physician so named was asked to accept the subscriber so named as his patient under the regulations of the corporation. If he wished to accept, he signed a form and became participating physician. Having once been so accepted, he was able to attend any subscriber who chose him. If either the subscriber or physician wished to drop the other, he might do so, since the scheme was voluntary in every particular. Similarly, the subscriber had the right to choose any other participating physician.

Obviously there were material advantages to the doctor, and in the experience of Associated Medical Services only one doctor has refused to act under the scheme. The rate and method of payment for services is on a fee-for-service basis, using the tariff as set out by the Ontario Medical Association. Since the Association pays all bills from its fund, the medical men are assured of prompt payment at rates which, if anything, are higher than most Ontario doctors get from regular practice. Then, of course, the doctors were promised freedom from the costs of sending out bills, the embarrassment of making collections and dealing with delinquent patients, of the necessity of bill-cutting.

One might dwell at some length on the successful and satisfactory operation of the scheme since it was established, and detail numerous instances of the relief afforded individuals and families from heavy expense-incurring illnesses, but broadly and succinctly this is summed up in the growth of the organization during the period covered. At the end of the first year, when operation of the plan was still confined to the city of Toronto, Associated Medical Services had 1,100 subscribers and more than 600 doctors on its rolls. This was approximately half the doctors in the Queen City, the family physicians of patients from all quarters who were putting their few cents a day into the insurance fund.

By the end of the second year, the Association had extended its scope to take in four other Ontario cities, and in these had 8,000 subscribers and 1,500 doctors actively participating. In addition to having provided medical care as guaranteed to all subscribers and paid all doctors at tariff rates, it had a substantial reserve on hand, sufficient at any time to pay off the original subsidy of the Ontario Medical Association.

The medical profession of Ontario is satisfied it has shown the way to a logical method of distributing the cost of medical care which does not disturb existing economics or relations. It started with an economically solvent group and has kept Associated Medical Services on the same basis. This has been possible through keeping administration in its own hands with expenses at a minimum. It is stated that the cost of service at the present time is six per cent which will be reduced as numbers increase. A preliminary survey of the incomes of subscribers shows that 97.9 per cent have incomes of less than \$4,000; 86.7 per cent of less than \$3,000; and 35 per cent of less than \$1,200 per annum. These figures would indicate that it is apparently the moderate-income groups which are taking advantage of the plan. At the same time, it is pointed out there is no reason to believe the plan cannot be made to cover the low-income group.

In its official report to the Ontario Medical Association, Associated Medical Services voices the opinion that it is a mistake on the part of medical men to assume that health-insurance plans must of necessity be under government control and subject to all the dangers of political influence. It believes it has demonstrated the ability of doctors to handle the problem in the economically solvent groups and sees no reason why, in cooperation with employers and the Government, the plan cannot be made applicable to the low-income groups and the indigent.

The Association has come to believe, also, that a process of gradual growth and expansion, such as has been its own experience to date, is much more sound and amendable to adjustment than the introduction of health insurance by Act of Parliament. It contrasts the example of British Columbia, which spent more than \$100,000, in addition to the cost of a plebiscite, in an attempt to launch a health-insurance scheme which proved abortive.

Though Associated Medical Services was launched and has grown in a modest and unspectacular way, it was inevitable its activities should attract very wide attention. The Federal Minister of Health cordially commended it. Every other Province has shown an interest, and some are preparing to follow Ontario's example. The organization has been investigated by official bodies from New Zealand and Australia and many States of the United States. Dr. J. A. Hannah visited Trenton upon invitation to speak to the medical society there on his plan. Four States, as has been seen, have already modeled voluntary health insurance plans on Canada's. Experience in the brief period of operation in the group of Ontario cities would appear to augur well for success across the border.

ENTHUSIASM over the visit of Their Britannic Majesties may tend to blind us in making some important decisions that are urgently awaiting Congress' determination. Upon these matters rest our future happiness and, possibly, prosperity. While we welcome most cordially the visits of friendly rulers of any nation and believe that such occasions should be marked with every courtesy befitting their rank and dignity, we should not allow ourselves to be influenced in our judgment as to our own best interests in conformity with our American principles and traditions. Analyze the visit of England's King and Queen as we will, one cannot overlook the unsettled state of affairs in Europe at the present moment and the bearing that visit has upon the promotion of public sentiment for a possible Anglo-American alliance in case a European war should eventuate.

The flames of war in the past few weeks have died down to the faintest smolderings. But the ashes are not dead, and there is reason to fear that the first blast of national ambitions and hatreds may fan the embers into a world-wide conflagration. It is at such times as the present that we must work most energetically to remove any provocation of war that may exist.

In the first place, we are constrained to repeat, as this Review has frequently pointed out, that the present unsettled political situation in Europe is no affair of ours. These issues are not of today or yesterday, nor is it the right or the duty of the Administration to attempt to determine who is right or who is wrong in these international disputes. It is diametrically contrary to our American policy, as proclaimed in the Monroe Doctrine, to join with any nation or bloc of nations in policing or quarantining the world. Despite frequent gratuitous assertions by Administration spokesmen that modern invention precludes the possibility of our traditional abstention policy, the fact remains that it has been done in Europe itself, and against fact there can be no argument.

We must insist upon our traditional policy, as voiced by Washington and Jefferson, of "peaceful and friendly relations with all nations, entangling alliances with none." Such a policy proclaims it to be the part of true Americanism to offer our good services in the capacity of mediator in disputes between nations, but it also supposes that we go into conferences with an open, unbiased mind, without recriminations hurled at either party, which would ruin our chances of effecting any results.

With the view of protecting our American interests, the dangerous elements in the present neutrality legislation before Congress must be eliminated. The sole authority to declare war rests with Congress and any transference of that power, whether virtual or actual, to the Chief Executive is a dangerous precedent that tends to weaken our democratic tradition and forfeit prerogatives belonging to the people which are fundamental in our American system of government.

### NON-CATHOLICS RECOGNIZE

GREAT numbers of non-Catholics came to the recent second National Catholic Social Action Congress in Cleveland. They attended the talks and forums, asked questions from the floor, demanded literature on Catholic social teachings, commented or reminisced as the inclination struck them. Some were experts on specialized topics, who gave the benefit of their information; others were simple inquirers. But one and all were in agreement on the fact that the Catholic Church has, as no other organization or society on earth, the keys to the solution of the burning social problems of the day.

### UNION YET FREEDOM IN T

ASSEMBLING in New York for its twenty-fifth annual convention, the Catholic Press Association of the United States has every reason for self-congratulation. The last few years have seen the Catholic press of the nation rapidly expand its format and arrangement, its scope of matter treated, its vitality and interest. Matters scantily treated but a few years ago, such as foreign and domestic missions, Catholic life in foreign countries, activities of the Holy See, progress of Catholic literature and drama, are now featured in the Catholic press by a stream of timely information.

Recent growth of popular interest in social and economic questions supplies for the Catholic publicist plenty of opportunity for comment and argument. But this growth brings also a problem, for the Catholic opinion that he is helping to build is increasingly perplexed at the variety of solutions offered for these questions, and bitter conflicts of opinion are created. The battle of opinion results in a warfare of epithets; satire draws satire; charges kindle counter-charges; and the result is apt to be disgust in the popular mind, stagnation in popular action.

Such a situation can be averted or at least greatly remedied by a clear distinction between doctrinal teachings on matters of social principle, upon which Catholics can and must agree, and their application to concrete affairs which have usually political implications. Unless this distinction is observed, there is danger that doctrine will become subordinate to politics.



## CATHOLICS CONCLUDE

SINCE this recognition is growing and spreading and becoming daily more articulate, is it not fit time for Catholics to follow it up with a corresponding emphasis upon the logical conclusion therefrom: that, if the reasonableness of Catholic social teaching is recognized, so, too, should the reasonableness be granted of the insistent Catholic demand for the recognition of God, the Author and ultimate End of the entire social order, in the country's schools? Fully to the point was Bishop Gannon's plea for such recognition. An old truth may gain entrance through new portals.

## IN THE CATHOLIC PRESS

Catholic influence for the good of the nation and the good of souls would be immeasurably helped if Catholic opinion could be united upon the application as upon the doctrines themselves. Certainly this is an end worth striving for. But nothing can force such a "united front." Its accomplishment depends in great measure upon the extent to which the Bishops of the country consider it desirable to achieve it. From a realistic point of view, the most practical manner to keep such conflicts from injuring the unity of our Catholic life in this country would appear to be that the distinction just mentioned be kept clear in the public mind.

If debatable matters which verge on the political field be treated as debatable, save where specific directions are afforded by the Bishops as to the line to be followed, ample room is left open for fruitful freedom of discussion, while the Faithful will not be perplexed by the doctors disagreeing among themselves.

The approach of a Presidential election, which bids fair to exceed all preceding in the subtlety and complexity of its propaganda, will make very difficult the observance of such a precaution. But the very difficulty of its observance is the reason why the policy is imperatively necessary, and the following couple of years offer an excellent opportunity for this policy to be abundantly exemplified. Recent utterances of many leading Catholic editors give ground to believe that they are fully alive to the need of amply clarifying the Catholic position on disputed matters.

## TWELVE YEARS, TOO MUCH

THE COUNTRY awaits the decision of President Roosevelt as to whether or not he chooses to stand for a third term. Members of his Cabinet and all others who have risen with the New Deal are pushing the movement to draft him as the candidate for 1940. Politicians are discussing the methods and stratagems by which the Democratic Convention will acclaim him. After the Senate and House wind up the session and clear out of Washington, it is stated, President Roosevelt will declare his intention, either welcoming or refusing the offer of four more years as President.

In the matter of a third term, there is no question of the Constitution, nor of the ideas of the Founding Fathers, nor of the resolutions of the Constitutional Convention. The issue is not that of tradition, nor is it that of precedent. Nor is the question that of the success or failure of President Roosevelt during his eight years in office. The sole issue is that of the preservation of our ideals and spirit in the system of American democracy.

If we had been living in the closing days of George Washington's second term, we would have stated our opposition to a third term for our first President. If Abraham Lincoln had lived till the end of his second term, and AMERICA were being published, we would have declared against a third term for President Lincoln. In the time of Washington, as in that of Lincoln, the conditions in the United States were perilous. Nevertheless, the conditions did not warrant the perpetuation of one man as Chief Executive beyond eight years, even though that man was Washington or Lincoln.

Today, we are vigorously opposed, and shall continue to express opposition vigorously, to a third term for President Roosevelt. Even if President Roosevelt had drawn the nation upward out of the depression, even if he had cured the evils of non-employment so that there actually were a labor shortage, even if he had succeeded in balancing the budget, even if he had stimulated private industry so that the country was materially prosperous, even if the legislation he sponsored had ameliorated economic and social conditions, even if he had inoculated the country against subversive foreignisms, even though, through eight years of labor and vision, he had brought the United States to the peak of her history, we would ask him, gracefully, to terminate his tenure of office and we would nominate him to the hall of fame, as a true patriot, as one devoted only to the good of the nation, without thought of self or of personal ambition.

It may be pleaded, realistically, that there is a crisis in the nation and that President Roosevelt, alone, can save us. Granted that there is a crisis: it faces us after his eight years! How many more years will he need to save us? We shall be saved by no one man, for that means dictatorship. We shall be saved by no single governing clique. We shall survive only through the due process of democracy, limiting our President. Twelve years carries us, we fear, straight toward a dictatorship.

## THE CARRY CLAUSE

SOME of the newspaper correspondents have been telling us that the Bloom Bill would "re-enact the cash-and-carry provisions" which expired on May 1.

This is a misleading statement. There is no carry clause in the Bloom Bill.

If and when the guns begin to go in Europe, the American people will make an enormous effort to hold tight and keep from slipping. But there is one thing which would madden us and change us overnight from a people vowed to peace into a furious nation clamoring for action. That would be the destruction of American ships and the killing of American seamen. On the day the headlines shriek that an American vessel, bound (let us say) to an English port, has been sunk by a German submarine, with the loss of American sailors' lives, that day will see the rise of the war fever in America.

It was to prevent the sinking of our ships—the greatest of all threats to our peace—that the carry clause of the Neutrality Act was written. This clause forbade American vessels to transport black-listed commodities to belligerents, or even to neutral nations for transshipment. It was a drastic provision, a sacrifice of rights not required by international law, and extremely hard on ship owners. But it promised more than anything else to keep us out of war.

There is no carry clause in the Bloom Bill. If it is passed, American ships will soon be carrying vitally needed supplies (except arms and ammunition) to the belligerents. Meanwhile, the warring nations will blockade one another's ports. Our ships and our seamen will be targets for the submarines. Our ships will go down; our men will die. The war drums will beat throughout this country, as they did in 1917.

Now, it is true that the Bloom Bill discusses combat areas "into which it will be unlawful for American ships and citizens to proceed." And at first sight this seems to protect us as much as the former carry clause.

But the Bill makes the naming of combat areas wholly discretionary with the President. He is not compelled to name any area. More important still, he may name some areas and refuse to name others.

A President who favored England over Germany, for instance, could forbid American ships from approaching German and Italian waters. At the same time he could permit them untrammelled access to British and French ports. In other words, the combat-area clause of the Bloom Bill is nothing else than the Thomas proposals in disguise. It gives the President complete freedom to "quarantine the aggressor" and "help the victim" nations, along with the privilege of deciding, all by himself, who the aggressor may be. Practically this means giving the President power to declare war, a power which pertains to Congress alone.

There is no carry clause in the Bloom Bill. But there is a provision permitting American ships and men to dare destruction, death and the consequent involvement of this country in war.

## THE CALL OF THE KING

ONCE upon a time, a young man came to consult Our Lord. He had always tried to serve God faithfully, walking in the way of the Commandments, but in his inmost heart he was not satisfied, for he knew that "something" was lacking. There was something more that he could do, but he did not know what it was, although from time to time he had caught a glimpse of this plan of God for his soul. Our Lord listened to him, looking on him with love, and then unfolded to him a way to God higher than that of the Commandments. It was the closer following of Christ along the way of the Evangelical Counsels, poverty, chastity and obedience. God wanted the young man to enter upon this way, but he held back. He had great wealth, and he could not give it up; or, rather, he failed to use the strengthening Grace which came with the vocation to relinquish all earthly ties and possessions.

A "vocation" is simply the call of God to the human soul, but here we use it in a restricted sense. God calls some souls to the married state, some to unmarried life in the world, with or without the vow of chastity or celibacy, or both; and some to the priesthood or to the Religious state. It is in this last sense that Catholic young people generally use the word when they think or talk about vocation.

Now, for everyone God has a vocation, and it is made known to him in divers ways. Rarely is the call revealed in a miraculous way, as it was to Saint Paul, or, as in the Gospel for tomorrow (Saint Luke v, 1-11) to Saints Peter and James and John. To the Apostle of the Gentiles the call came in that blinding flash as he rode to Damascus to begin a persecution of Christ's followers. To the first Vicar of Christ and his companions, it came in the form of a direct commission, "from henceforth thou shalt catch men," with the commission preceded by a miraculous draught of fishes.

But usually God manifests His invitation through natural means. The idea of helping Christ to catch souls presents itself to the young man or woman. It is welcomed, or perhaps repelled, but in this case it usually returns. After prayer, reflection and counsel with Christ's representatives, it appears that the individual has or has not the necessary qualities of mind and heart. Application is made to the Bishop or to the Religious prelate, and he or she is accepted as a candidate. But human weakness may hold some back, for as Newman wrote: "The world looks bright to inexperienced eyes." They cannot see that it is not gold, but fool's gold. Like the young man in the Gospel, they leave Jesus and walk no more with Him.

God can draw His own from the pit of iniquity, but the usual nursery of vocations is the good Catholic home. Wise parents do not talk much about vocation, preferring to pray for their children and to give them good example. Next to the home is the Catholic school. We who are indifferent fishers of men can win new workers for Christ by helping the Catholic school, and by praying that Christ's spirit may rule every Catholic family.



# CHRONICLE

---

---

**THE ADMINISTRATION.** The Export-Import Bank announced it would extend credits to Paraguay for support of currency, building of public works. Credits have previously been arranged for Brazil, Haiti and Nicaragua. Purpose of the credits: to combat European economic penetration in South America. . . . Hungary made a partial payment of \$9,828.16 on its debt to the United States. Hungary has been making payments since December, 1937. . . . Speaking at the West Point commencement exercises, President Roosevelt said: "The nation's desire for peace must never be mistaken for weakness." The visit of the British King and Queen, he declared, was "a courteous recognition of the cordiality and good-will that prevails between two great nations." . . . Following abolition of the Albanian Foreign Office, Secretary Hull withdrew the United States legation from Albania. . . . Finland paid its war-debt instalment of \$160,693, as usual. . . . The President signed the bill authorizing laying up of \$100,000,000 worth of war materials, such as tin and rubber, which are not available in sufficient quantities in the United States. . . . The Commerce Department disclosed the national income in 1938 was \$64,000,000,000. It was \$72,000,000,000 in 1937; \$40,000,000,000 in 1932; \$82,000,000,000 in 1929. Employees received 67.3 per cent of the 1938 national income. . . . Declaring "he lacks the essential qualifications of a librarian," the American Library Association requested the Senate to deny confirmation to the Leftist poet, Archibald MacLeish, nominated by President Roosevelt, as Librarian of Congress. Confirmation of MacLeish would be a calamity, the Association asserted.

**WASHINGTON.** The Department of Agriculture estimated the gross income of farmers during 1938 at \$9,220,000,000. . . . Government Reorganization Plans, numbers one and two, were signed by the President, will become effective July 1. . . . The National Economy League issued a report on its survey of relief. Putting the chief blame on the WPA, the report disclosed that overhead costs of relief administration have gone up from ten to twenty-five per cent during seven years. In that time Federal, State and local governments disbursed \$20,500,000,000 on relief. Relief costs have not declined during times of business improvement, the survey revealed. WPA costs were 237 per cent in excess of direct relief now given by State and local governments, the report said. . . . John L. Lewis, C.I.O. chieftain, declared it was impossible to make peace with the A. F. of L. He attacked Congress for having done "worse than nothing" to aid the unemployment situation. . . . On motion of Senator LaFollette, the "Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction" was printed as a Senate docu-

ment. The Program was issued twenty years ago. Said Senator LaFollette: "...all but one of the objectives enunciated in the program have been wholly or partially enacted into law."

— — —

**THE CONGRESS.** President Roosevelt's request for \$340,000 for a Byrd Antarctic expedition was refused by the House Appropriations Committee. . . . Taking action directly contrary to a Senate bill, the House passed a measure confining the Tennessee Valley Authority to a defined area, taking it out of competition with private companies, placing its financial affairs under General Accounting Office scrutiny. . . . The Bloom Neutrality Bill, suggested by the Administration, was reported favorably by the Foreign Affairs Committee to the House. The measure places no embargo on sale of arms and implements of war, gives great discretion to the President. . . . Characterizing the Bloom bill as a surrender of the war-making powers of Congress to the President, Representative Fish declared: "A vote for the Bloom bill, with the known views of the President, is virtually empowering the President to take us into war on the side of Great Britain." Representative Bloom defended his bill as designed to keep the country out of war. . . . Amendments to the Social Security Act were passed by the House, forwarded to the Senate. The amendments ease somewhat the financial burdens on employers, and yet extend benefits to more people. 1,100,000 additional persons—seamen, bank employees, employed people over sixty-five—are brought under the old-age insurance benefits; 200,000 more persons are brought under the unemployment insurance benefits. . . . Abolition of the undistributed profits tax, substitution of a flat eighteen per-cent tax on corporations earning \$25,000 or more annually, other encouragements to business, were approved by a House Ways and Means subcommittee. . . . The 1940 Relief Bill designed to put an end to the influence of the Communist-dominated Workers Alliance over the WPA was reported to the House. The Federal Theatre Project would be eliminated by the bill. . . . Twenty-two million people are now receiving some form of relief. . . . A telegram to King George urging payment of the British war debt was read to the House by Representative Sweeney.

— — —

**AT HOME.** Dr. Neil Van Aken, president of the Foreign Government Commissioners Club at the New York World's Fair, publicly assailed the situation at the Fair. Foreign exhibitors who brought from their native lands specialized workers and artists were compelled by labor unions to employ at full rates union members to stand by doing noth-

ing except watching the foreign specialists doing the work. If these union members stood by after the regular time for quitting, they charged time and one-half, Dr. Van Aken said. . . . The Missouri Senate and House passed a bill to place the Kansas City Police Department under State control. . . . After Homer Martin's A. F. of L. United Automobile Workers Union staged a strike at General Motors plants in Flint, Mich., C.I.O. United Automobile Workers crossed the A. F. of L. picket lines, with ensuing mass fist fights. Serious rioting broke out also at the Allis-Chalmers plant in the suburbs of Milwaukee, where the C.I.O. struck.

GREAT BRITAIN. The London Government requested Germany to withdraw the Reich consul in Liverpool, asserting he was implicated in espionage. . . . Over a wide area of Britain small bombs appeared in the mails. They exploded under the stamp-canceling machines. . . . Prime Minister Chamberlain reminded Chancellor Hitler of his readiness to "discuss any method by which reasonable aspirations on the part of other nations could be satisfied, even if this meant some adjustment of the existing state of things," provided such a discussion could take place in "an atmosphere of mutual confidence." . . . Hitler's success in convincing the German people that Britain was attempting to encircle the Reich was said to be causing concern in Downing Street. In the House of Lords, Lord Halifax declared that Germany could acquire "economic Lebensraum" if she would cease threatening the independence of her neighbors. . . . General Gamelin, supreme commander of all French defense forces, had a four-day consultation with British army heads in London. . . . Prime Minister Chamberlain angrily denied in the House of Commons the charge that he was trying "to wriggle back to the Munich policy." Britain was still seeking the pact with Russia, her leaders indicated. . . . In Palestine, a seventeen-year-old Jewish girl was sentenced by a British court to life imprisonment for attempting to plant a bomb hidden in a basket of fruit. Men dressed in European clothes dragged five Arabs from their homes, shot them. . . . Arabs fired on a Jewish bus. . . . Seven bombs exploded in Tel Aviv.

CHINA-JAPAN. The Chinese National Defense Council ordered the arrest of Wang Ching-wei, former Chinese political leader. Wang has been working for peace with Japan and contacting Japanese authorities. . . . Both the Chinese and the Japanese were said to be obtaining huge revenues from the opium trade. . . . At a dinner in Nanking, twenty Japanese officials became desperately ill after drinking wine. Chinese poisoned the wine, Nipponese charged. . . . Japan inaugurated an economic blockade of the British and French concessions in Tientsin. Business firms inside the concessions were prevented from communicating with the outside city. The blockade followed when concession officials refused to surrender four Chinese

prisoners demanded by the Japanese. . . . Britain was considering possible economic reprisals for the closing of the concessions. . . . Japanese air raiders heavily bombed Chengtu and Chungking. Catholic missionary properties have been badly damaged by the continuous air raids.

GERMANY. The Catholic Young Men's Society in the diocese of Muenster was dissolved by the Hitler regime. Its belongings were confiscated by the State. . . . Protestant leaders continued to fight against a Government-controlled Church council which was, these leaders declared, "conducting a battle against the Bible's Holy Word." . . . Referring to the royal visit to the United States, German papers asserted Britain has organizations in America working for an Anglo-American alliance. One editor said the Foreign Policy Association, the Carnegie Foundation and the New York Times were working for such an alliance. . . . In an attempt to find the killer of a German policeman, German police staged a house-to-house search in Kladno, Bohemia, arrested many Czechs. The Czech officials of the district were dismissed, a fine of 500,000 crowns placed on the township. German authorities threatened to execute anyone withholding information concerning the killer. . . . A Czech policeman was shot at Nachod.

SPAIN. In a Barcelona courtroom, thirty witnesses told of small, insanely decorated cells where prisoners were tortured to the point of madness by the Loyalists. A Yugoslav architect accused of constructing the cells for the Loyalists was on trial. Many Nationalists became blind or insane in the cells, witnesses said. The cells, four feet high, contained a slanting bed arranged so that a prisoner could not sit down or lie down more than a few minutes at a time. Blocks were placed in a position to prevent the prisoner from standing up. Other forms of torture were described. . . . The Falange Española Grand Council met at Burgos. Addressing it, Generalissimo Franco indicated he intended to avoid foreign credits as far as he could. Redistribution of large estates was decreed by the Council. . . . Spanish newspapers charged Reds in the United States were promoting a campaign "inciting American citizens" to adopt Spanish children, prevent their return to Spain. The campaign was characterized as "collective kidnaping."

THE VATICAN. Pope Pius XII warmly greeted 3,200 Spanish soldiers who served in the Italo-Spanish Arrow division in Spain. They brought him great consolation, for "you have been defenders of the Faith and of civilization," the Holy Father told them. After calling on Our Lady of Sorrows to console Spanish orphaned children and mothers deprived of their sons, the Pope said: "We recall . . . when churches were deprived of the Cross of Christ. Spain without the Cross would not be chivalrous, Christian Spain."



# CORRESPONDENCE

---

## THE GENTLEMAN MAKES AMENDS

EDITOR: It was with some surprise that I read the takings-to-task administered to me by Edith Ray Sands and "Maryland Woman," because I could not conceive that I should have accused Southern ladies in general of snobbery. So, at once I turned to the offending column (April 29, AMERICA) to refresh my memory on what I had said. My surprise was even greater to read the following two sentences:

I am sure that no such motives as these [the pronoun has no antecedent] prompted the ladies of our federated garden clubs to arrange for an annual public opening of the great houses of Virginia and Maryland. It was probably, rather, an unmingled motive of pride and (may I breathe the word) snobbery.

I am forced, very shamefacedly, to confess that no one could know what the first sentence is all about, and I am a little doubtful myself about the "unmixed" mixture in the second. Inexcusable carelessness on my part caused me to leave out a sentence in my typed copy. So all I can do is apologize for the sentences as they stand. I know what I *meant* to say, but as far as the public is concerned, I didn't say it.

Here is what a mind-reader might have understood: that the houses were not opened in order to promote sociological speculation, but rather because of legitimate pride and a wee, wee trace of snobbery. Since I was not certain that the element of fund raising for the excellent purpose of restoring or maintaining certain historic houses and gardens is universal, I thought it best not to mention it.

But that is certainly not what was printed, and for the meaningless two sentences, again apologies.

What does puzzle me, though, is why "Maryland Woman" should be so upset at my very mild remarks about slavery. Is one a dangerous Red because one says that—even though we would not wish to see it restored—slavery resulted in a way of life "which has its justification and its nobility"? Or is it of dubious orthodoxy to suggest that a society based upon slavery was truly a "mode of living, not a mere vain show"? Many a Yankee would not grant half as much!

And why the indignation at what I supposed was a commonplace of historical information, that Southern gentlemen liked privacy? I have a great deal of sympathy with their preferences in this matter, and certainly I hope there is nothing reprehensible about it. In fact one of the troubles with New England villages has always been that your neighbors are likely to know altogether too much about your private life. As for the suggestion that there were very few roads in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, that is, in a relative

sense, true; but roads there were and houses were built away from them—plenty of those houses at quite a distance from navigable water, too.

But I'm afraid the whole thing boils down to that word, "snobbery." I should never have used it, even though I never, never thought it is equivalent to *gaucherie*, as Mrs. Sands would have it. Quite the contrary. Snobs are often charming people. Their only trouble, in my meaning of the term, is that either they value the right things for the wrong reasons, or the wrong things for the right reasons, and I'm sure I do not know which is worse.

But I'll make one promise anyway—I'll never (what never? . . .) use the word again, and whenever I talk about motives, I'll read my copy over twice before sending it to the long-suffering Editor.

New York, N. Y.

HARRY LORIN BINSSE

## TO ALL WHO HELPED

EDITOR: The National Convention of *Auxilio Social* is aware in detail of the efforts of yourself and the America Spanish Relief Fund in helping us in the difficult task that has been committed to our charge, to secure food and happiness for all the needy homes of Spain.

Your gracious effort merits on my part a hearty expression of well deserved gratitude, and the assurance that your labor has not been useless, since not a single ounce of what you sent us has failed to be placed at the service of the needy.

I sincerely thank all the generous contributors to our necessities, and in the name of our organization as well as in my own name, I repeat my sincere acknowledgement.

Valladolid, Spain MERCEDES SANZ BACHILLER  
National President, *Auxilio Social*

## SWISS LIBERTY

EDITOR: I read with astonishment, to say the least, the article, *Free Switzerland Will Be Free No Longer* (AMERICA, May 13), by Marieli Benziger, which contained, together with a certain number of truths and half-truths, some gratuitous and even false assertions. I beg the courtesy of your columns to indicate these for rectification.

1. Swiss neutrality is not a measure of political opportunism in order to escape Nazi terrorism. It is based on a time-honored tradition which goes back to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The recent diplomatic action has been nothing more than a renewed declaration of a situation which has existed *de facto* and *de jure*. It has been necessitated by the adherence of Switzerland to the League of Nations and the engagements which that adherence implies. The League has recognized this situation and has dispensed Switzerland from cer-

tain obligations which are incompatible with her neutrality.

2. The assertion that Switzerland is divided into forty-two Nazi *Gaus*, that the Nazi organization extends "to the most distant village and furthest mountain," seems to imply that the Nazis are favored by the Swiss people. This conclusion is purely and simply false. No better evidence of this could be had than the result of the most recent elections at Zurich as well as at Geneva and elsewhere. It was a complete collapse of the extreme Right parties with radical tendencies. In regard to certain sympathizers it can be said that there are hot-heads everywhere, but no further conclusion can be drawn.

3. The Swiss press has manifested a self-imposed reserve in reporting events beyond the Rhine which is quite understandable, considering the circumstances. But to conclude from this that the press has systematically suppressed everything which has reference to its great neighbor, and in particular to the religious persecution there, is purely gratuitous. If there is a press well informed on this subject, it is surely the Swiss press. This is certainly attested by the fact that almost all the large daily papers are barred from Germany.

4. Swiss commerce is not so badly handicapped by German competition as Marieli Benziger would have one understand. On the contrary, the industry of the great nations, heavily engaged as they are in the armament race, have left the field free to the peaceful Swiss industry. One has but to consult official industrial statistics as proof of this.

5. Anti-Semitism is no stronger in Switzerland than in democratic America. That a certain impatience should manifest itself before the influx of exiled Jews is understandable, the more so inasmuch as Switzerland cannot help them because of the considerable density of the population in relation to her habitable land.

6. It is quite easy to discredit the collective probity of the Swiss customs officials on the basis of a few anecdotes. However such a procedure is as false as it is unjust.

I strongly urge Marieli Benziger to visit the Swiss National Exposition at Zurich. On the army building she will see three phrases which express the true thought of the large majority of the Swiss people: "Switzerland can defend herself. Switzerland wants to defend herself. Switzerland will defend herself." She will sell her liberty only at the price of her blood.

Fribourg, Switzerland.      JEAN PAUL HAAS

## PROGRAM FOR FOURTH

EDITOR: Recently (June 3) you presented a program for next Fourth of July.

I have been put to the task of writing the centenary history of Ferdinand, Indiana, a Catholic German town and parish founded in 1840. One page will show how these Catholic German backwoodsmen, under the guidance of the Benedictine Fathers, anticipated your program.

At Ferdinand, the Fourth used to be an occa-

sion for a not merely civic but a religious-patriotic celebration. In 1860, a reveille at five o'clock in the morning opened the day. A parade, consisting of the band, the *Sänger Verein*, cavalry and citizens, marched through the town, then to church, where a High Mass was celebrated.

At ten o'clock, a *Freiheits Baum* (liberty pole) was raised in the street, the flag hoisted, a speaker orated on the "garrand and gallorious day," and the Declaration of Independence was read in English and German. After that, a picnic.

In 1861, four additional, though smaller, poles were raised at the four street intersections where the Corpus Christi altars used to stand. "Impressive services were held in the Catholic Church"; so the *Jasper Courier* reported.

But most noteworthy was the centennial celebration, in 1876, of the Declaration of Independence. It is told best in Father Eberhard Stadler's *Announcement Book*, on July 2:

Next Tuesday, also we as Catholics will celebrate most solemnly the hundredth anniversary of the founding of American liberty. Early, at six o'clock, High Mass with sermon; after that a *Te Deum* and Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. I expect a numerous attendance to give thanks to God for the blessings and the happiness of our fatherland and to pray Him to continue to bless and to protect it. The liberty poles (that is, the five of them) will be erected. At two o'clock in the afternoon there will be an entertainment in Herman Beckmann's tobacco house. "That in all things God be glorified."

The parish and town, since 1853, have been entrusted to the pastoral care of the Benedictines of Saint Meinrad's Abbey.

St. Meinrad, Ind.      ALBERT KLEBER, O.S.B.

## RIGHT TO CHANGE

EDITOR: When Congress convened, the President, in his report on the state of the nation, lauded the promise-keeping nations of Europe. In the midst of acclaim from his erstwhile enemies he submitted a relief bill that took their breath away the next day. The bill met stiff opposition and some reduction. Then the Administration became more emphatic in support of non-aggressor nations. Finally, notes were sent to their opponents proclaiming their unmitigated culpability. Meanwhile, Congress weakened and consented to an increased appropriation, although less than enough to satisfy the President.

The prospects of the President being held over are much better if a war is provoked and military censorship of radio and press is in effect. If war does not occur, the WPA, under an efficient spoils system, probably could accomplish the same result, although the risk is greater.

While legislation to make a civil-service system compulsory would not directly "contribute to recovery," it is the biggest single contribution Congress can make to protect its own independence and the right of the public to change its officials in a practical way. That right, under the exercise of which the nation became great, if kept in theory and not in fact, might never be recaptured.

New York, N. Y.      HENRY V. MORAN



# LITERATURE AND ARTS

---

## BE WARY OF WORDSWORTH'S SESTET TO "THE VIRGIN"

HUGH F. SMITH, S.J.

---

IT WAS May and we were studying poetry. Inevitably, Wordsworth's sonnet "The Virgin," was assigned as one of the poems to be discussed, and I was reading it over in preparation. Familiarly the lines ran:

Mother! Whose virgin bosom was uncrosth  
With the least shade of thought to sin allied;  
Woman! above all women glorified,  
Our tainted nature's solitary boast;  
Purer than foam on central ocean tost;  
Brighter than eastern skies at daybreak strewn  
With fancied roses, than the unblemished moon  
Before her wane begins on heaven's blue coast;

Years ago in school these lines had been pointed out to me—no doubt I had to commit them to memory—as containing one of the highest poetical tributes to the Immaculate Conception, and as such they had deeply impressed me. To me, as to most Catholic students, the lines above were enough; for us they made the poem. I do not recall paying much heed to the sestet; I must have taken it for granted. But when one has a class of young men to consider, one cannot afford to take things for granted. I read on:

Thy image falls to earth. Yet some, I ween,  
Not unforgiven, the suppliant knee might bend  
As to a visible power, in which did blend  
All that was mixed and reconciled in thee  
Of a mother's love with maiden purity,  
Of high with low, celestial with terrene.

Just what I had taken from those lines in student days, I do not recall. It seems to me now that I interpreted the opening thought as a reference to the beauty of the virtues of Our Lady nobly inspiring and eliciting the admiration of her children still on earth. The "not unforgiven" indicated that the supplication, presumably for forgiveness, was not unheeded. Now with the coming discussion in view I had my doubts about such an interpretation and instigated a little private investigation—as teachers will.

I write down my findings at the risk of letting it be known that I am now coming to the knowledge of what everyone else knew all along, but even that cannot disturb the joy of discovery which I have experienced. I do not pretend to be a student of Wordsworth, nor even an ardent admirer. Some of

his lyrics have brought real pleasure, especially the early ones, but his sonnets had small appeal. I could see why the poet's "respectability" and pomposity could incite the annoyed Edward Fitzgerald to refer to him as "Daddy" Wordsworth. Yet I would never deny that he possessed high poetic ability which was frequently manifested in poems of merit. Here I am merely trying to explain why I had not hitherto examined his works more thoroughly.

I began my research (to use a dignified term) with a number of anthologies, surveys of English literature, and some literary criticisms and commentaries. To give the paper a scientific tone I shall divide these works into two groups, which I shall call Group A and Group B. In Group A, let us place all which were designed for use in Catholic schools; in Group B, those intended for general use. My investigation was by no means exhaustive, nor remarkably thorough, but I did consult a good number of volumes. In those listed under Group A, the sonnet was usually inserted and without comment; one or two compilers expressed surprise that such a high tribute to the Immaculate Conception should come from a Protestant poet. (I later learned that this was not the most surprising feature of its composition.) In Group B, this sonnet was never included, nor was any reference made to it. Thus far I had found little help. Now I turned to the collected works of Wordsworth in hope of finding an enlightening footnote. The collection at my disposal included three volumes on the poet's life, Doctor William Knight being the editor.

Here is where I made a startling discovery. I had never known—I openly acknowledge my ignorance—that "The Virgin" was anything but an isolated sonnet. Now I found it was but one of the 132 sonnets which comprise Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Sketches*. But was my ignorance wholly culpable? Group A had made no mention of this series; Group B often passed over it in silence, and whenever mention was made of it, this particular sonnet was not pointed out. One who reads these sonnets can readily understand that they were written during the poet's long "period of stagnation." As poetry,

no author whom I had consulted praised them, and but one, Oliver Elton, commented on any particular sonnets in the series. He mentions three as above the ordinary run of them, saying that one in particular had received "once more the 'unimaginable touch' that the writer seemed to have lost." Our sonnet was not included in the three. It must suffice here to state that the series is generally considered to possess small poetical value.

We have a different reason for considering these sonnets here. They will give us the setting of the poem under discussion, and I believe that they will help us to understand the meaning of the sestet. They are intended to form a history of the Established Church of England from the introduction of Christianity into Britain through the "consummation of the Papal dominion" to the then present time. It will be helpful for our purpose to consider how they ever came to be written.

Wordsworth had paid a visit to Sir George Beaumont at Coleorton to help him select a site for a new church on his property. In memory of this visit he wrote two sonnets about the new church. This visit seems to have turned his attention to ecclesiastical topics, and the Catholic Question, then agitated in Parliament, kept his thoughts on the same topic. Hence we find in a letter written by his sister Dorothy, March 27, 1821, to a Mrs. Clarkson: "William is at present composing a series of sonnets on a subject which I am sure you would never divine—the Church of England—but you will perceive that, in the hands of a poet, it is one that will furnish ample store of poetic materials." Ah, the blindness of sisterly affection! Simultaneously, but independently, Southey had begun his history in prose, and both were elated when they heard of each other's work. Thus the series had begun.

Wordsworth's stand on the Catholic Question, which had kept his mind "on ecclesiastical topics," will readily suggest the tone of the series. To him the admission of Catholics to Parliament would effect dire consequences. His opposition is clearly brought out in the following excerpts from letters he wrote to Viscount Lowther, the son of the Earl of Lonsdale:

Be not startled when I say I am averse to further concessions to the Roman Catholics. . . . Deeming the Church Establishment not only a fundamental part of our Constitution, but one of the greatest upholders and propagators of Civilization in our country, and, lastly, the most effectual and main support of religious Toleration, I cannot but look with jealousy upon measures which must reduce her relative influence. . . .

The tone is likewise reflected from his reply to a criticism. The poet has explained his purpose in writing the series, and states that they had been composed long before intense interest had been stirred up in matters ecclesiastical. He continues:

The former particular is mentioned as an excuse for my having fallen into an error. . . . I allude to the last Sonnet but one of the first series, where Pope Alexander III at Venice is described as setting his foot on the neck of Emperor Barbarossa. Though this is related as a fact in history, I am told it is a mere legend of no authority. Substitute for it an

undeniable truth *not less fitted for my purpose* (italics are my own), namely the penance inflicted by Gregory VII upon the Emperor Henry the Fourth.

This is the background in general of the sonnet, "The Virgin." I must make it clear that I have not read all the sonnets which make up this tedious series—one derives small pleasure in reading a work which depreciates or ridicules beliefs and practices which one holds most sacred. I have read those which form the proximate setting of our sonnet. In the second part of the series where the poet is giving incidents of King Henry VIII's reign, he has this order of subjects: "Corruption of the Higher Clergy," "Abuse of Monastic Power," "Monastic Voluptuousness," "Dissolution of the Monasteries," two more sonnets on this last subject, "The Saints," and "The Virgin." This is the shady setting of his beautiful and often quoted tribute to the Blessed Mother.

Finally, to come to the interpretation of the sestet, we need now but consider a few of the preceding poems. In the trio on the dissolution of monasteries, the poet considers the monks and nuns as they are turned from their cloisters and return to the world. Then he turns to the Saints. These, too, as far as their statues and pictures are concerned, must leave England. The sonnet begins:

Ye, too, must fly before a chasing hand,  
Angels and Saints, in every hamlet mourned!

This much, I believe, is sufficient to give us the meaning of the phrase, "Thy image falls to earth." The poet refers to no more poetic thought than that the statues of Our Lady are no longer permitted in England. What follows is also clarified by the preceding sonnet on the Saints.

Ah! if the old idolatry be spurned,  
Let not your radiant Shapes desert the Land:

going on to remind the Saints that they themselves had never demanded adoration. With this Protestant misconception of the Catholic attitude towards the use of images, it becomes clear what is meant by the words in our sonnet, "not unforgiven." Wordsworth is becoming broadminded, and apologizes, as it were, for the misguided Catholics who have bent a suppliant knee before an image of the Blessed Virgin: they will not go unforgiven for this "idolatry." "As to a visible power" again, it seems to me, refers to the homage paid to statues. In a preceding sonnet, a most distasteful one, "Transubstantiation," the poet has reminded us that Waldo, condemned by the Lateran Council in 1179, would not tolerate worship paid to God except as to "the Invisible, and Him alone." Hence, I conclude that in this sonnet on the Virgin, he refers to the "visible power" as it was manifested in the images of Our Lady. Thus I now interpret the sestet.

I wrote above that the strangest feature of the composition of "The Virgin" was not that its author was a Protestant. I find it very much stranger that in a series of sonnets, some really bitter, this little gem has its setting. I do not accuse the poet of insincerity in offering his beautiful tribute to the Immaculate Mother of God: he did not know the whole truth. The tribute to me is still beautiful, but the sestet has lost its beauty.



# BOOKS

---

## SON OF NAPOLEON THIRD

THE PRINCE IMPERIAL. By Katherine John. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$3.50

IN the year 1879, a heartbroken mother opened her dead son's Missal. This was, in part, what he had set down, and had been repeating every day: "My God, I give Thee my heart, do Thou give me faith. Without faith there is no fervent prayer, and prayer is a need of my soul." Only a few weeks before, as a "spectator" in the Zulu War, he had been a member of a small party—an officer and six men—that had been ordered forward to choose a camping ground for the advancing Second British Division. When the troopers were suddenly attacked by thirty-six Zulus, the young man failed to escape. His friends found the body the following morning. A doctor counted eighteen wounds, all in front; the back was untouched, except where an assegai had pierced through. The Prince Imperial, who had known so well how to live and how to die, had achieved his destiny.

When Napoleon III was forty-five, he married Eugénie Montijo, a Spanish beauty of twenty-six. Shortly after the conclusion of the Crimean War, one hundred and one cannon of the *Invalides* announced the birth of a son. From the moment he could be said to know anything, the child knew that he was a soldier, and that a soldier was incomparably the finest thing one could be. He quickly became the pet and mascot of the entire nation. In his studies, however, the little Fauntleroy made about as much progress as a fly in a glue pot. In 1870, he went off, charming and gleeful in his lieutenant's uniform, to see some genuine Napoleonic victories. He was dragged right through the disastrous campaign and, after Sedan, found himself at Chiselhurst in England with his mother. He was enrolled as a cadet at Woolwich and graduated with honors. When his friends departed for the Zulu campaign, he refused to be left behind. Besides, it was good policy to go: France would hear of him.

Mrs. John has given us a witty, slangy, unsentimental biography of the young soldier and pretender who, quite exceptionally, added some luster to the Bonaparte name. While the portrait of the Prince Imperial is well drawn, the author's knowledge of the history of the Second Empire is too obviously rudimentary. Her constant use of French words and phrases is somewhat annoying. This reviewer would prefer to read biographies in one language at a time.

JOHN J. O'CONNOR

## THE STORY OF VIRGINIA RETOLD

THE JAMES. By Blair Niles. Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50

THE Rivers of America Series is, according to its editor, Constance Lindsay Skinner, "a literary and not an historical series, one in which people are supreme, events are secondary." The conception of the series is admirable; the execution of *The James*, fifth volume in the series, falls just a bit short. It might have been the magnificent "plantation epic" Mrs. Niles planned. Instead it merely retells the well known story of the founding and growth of Virginia through episodic accounts of the lives of famous Virginians: John Smith and Po-

cahontas typify the founding; Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry, colonial days; Robert E. Lee, Matthew Maury and Edgar Allen Poe, the Civil War and reconstruction; down to the present century with Bill Robinson, Woodrow Wilson, Dr. Goodwin and the rebuilding of Williamsburg. For a book laboring under the obvious handicap of retelling an almost hackneyed story that covers three centuries, it succeeds surprisingly well.

Its author, Mrs. Niles, is the O. O. McIntyre of the James River valley. Homey details of life and love on the banks of the "muddy Jeems" are her forte. Lee was wild about fried chicken; red roses blooming are the focal point of the battle of Seven Pines; Roger Pryor wooed his future wife by gifts of Shakespeare's volumes; Colonial days witnessed a large importation from England of men's hair nets. These and a thousand other tiny details add color to conventional portraits.

The book is frankly sentimental. For example, it warns you that "when you come to know (Washington) . . . the very postage stamps and dollar bills which now perpetuate the modest wisdom of his face will strangely quicken your heart." The style is overly dramatic. Witness the drawn-out account of the deaths of Jefferson and Adams on the fourth of July, with its final paragraph: "Many wondered if there was some portentous, awful meaning in their passing together on that day."

Yet despite its sentimentality, its occasional lack of unity, its striving after dramatic intensity, *The James* has two redeeming qualities. It is immensely readable, and it is, despite its emphasis on romance, decent. And that, in this day when so many histories are mere catalogs of events, and so many biographies are vicious, "sty's the limit" revelations of private lives, is no mean achievement.

PAUL L. O'CONNOR

## A PROGRAM OF ACTION BUILT ON MAN'S PERSONALITY

A PERSONALIST MANIFESTO. By Emmanuel Mounier. Longmans, Green and Co. \$2

THOSE who have followed the *Esprit* in France are acquainted with the ideas and provisory scheme for social and economic reform contained in the *Manifesto*. It is a movement quite broad in its doctrine and policy, contenting itself with a pooling of Christian records and founded on a least common denominator of Christian cooperation. That common denominator is the primacy of the spiritual among human values and the recognition of human personality as of fundamental importance in all schemes for social and economic amelioration.

We are warned in the foreword that the basic inspiration of the *Manifesto* is French, and hence the application to the actual conditions of family life and the position of woman is cast on a French background which can only be applicable in a general manner and with many reservations to our American situation. The emphasis or, more correctly, overemphasis on human personality will not appeal to the reader outside France who is familiar with the stress placed on the social conception by Catholic writers under the inspiration of Catholic teaching on the Mystical Body of Christ and the light of the Leonine and Pian Encyclicals on Social Reconstruction.

Catholics are taught to believe that the stressing and isolation of any factor, however important and worthy an element, can only eventuate in confusion and frustration. To exaggerate the rôle and nature of the human

person and bedeck it with a shadowy toggery of adornment means the spoliation of the social concept. Here we have "the stressing of the supreme focal importance of the human person." The distinctions, none too sound, certainly unconventional and untraditional in metaphysics of modern French authors, have not been any too enthusiastically received by thinkers outside of France.

It is this overemphasis and isolation that carries the author of the *Manifesto* beyond the traditional bounds in his evaluation of capitalism and bourgeois civilization. The "Personalist" group, we should remember, embraces Catholics, Protestants and non-Christians. Catholics who may feel themselves getting lost in the none too clear atmosphere of the French writer would do well to consult Dr. Leen's Introduction to *The True Vine and Its Branches* where the true position between the totalitarian and the personalist is more securely stated. Nor is the appeal to supernatural heroism very helpful in a plan of social order, no matter how immensely useful and necessary for the individual.

But the *Manifesto* is to be praised for its forthright speaking, invigorating enthusiasm—witness the remarkable spirit of the Jocists—and its renunciation of all forms of state totalitarianism. Despite the indefatigable labors of the Benedictine translators of St. John's Abbey, Minn., under the lead of the lamented Virgil Michel, the book is none too clear. It is welcomed as a sincere contribution to the collective efforts directed to a program of social reconstruction. WILLIAM J. BENN

THE NEW HOPE SERIES. By T. Gavan Duffy. *The City House Alumnae, Convent of The Sacred Heart, St. Louis*. \$1.00 each.

THESE charming Mission stories by Father Gavan Duffy, are more than mere beggar books, though there is begging at the bottom of this project. They are, under the titles *Fantastic Uncle*, *The Blind Spot*, *The Voyager*, *The Sower Went Out*, as readable a collection of Mission tales as it has ever been this reviewer's privilege to find. A pity they were not all put in a single book! But Father Gavan Duffy tells the experiences of a Missionary in India with such humor, delightfulness, such sound instruction and excellent writing that you will find yourself, while learning how he attempts to save the souls of these primitives, being coaxed into wanting very much to save your own. LEONARD FEENEY

LET ME THINK. By H. A. Overstreet.

WHICH WAY AMERICA? By Lyman Bryson.

HERE COMES LABOR. By Chester M. Wright.

THEY WORKED FOR A BETTER WORLD. By Allan Seager. The Macmillan Co. 60 cents each.

THESE little books are the first four on the list of "The Peoples Library," a new series, which is being subsidized by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation and planned and edited by a committee of the American Association for Adult Education.

*Let Me Think* discusses no ultimates. It does not ask: What is mind or man? It is concerned with the here and now, not with the whence and whither of mind. Containing much practical advice about the part thinking should play in the business of life, labor and the pursuit of happiness, it is filled with illustrations drawn largely from the author's personal observation and experience. The writer thinks the story of Adam and Eve is an "old folk tale," and that in life, it is the game and quest, not the goal, that matters.

*Which Way America?* tells about Communism, Fascism, Nazism and the American plan. Brevity necessitates selection, omission, emphasis. A Catholic would have stressed the atheistic philosophy of Communism. Many will disagree with the opinion that in Russia, "As far as 'ownership' is concerned everything seems to be working very well." Emphasizing the persecutions of Jews in Germany, the author says little or nothing of the persecution of Catholics and Protestants. Fascism is very decidedly explained as a reaction against Communism, but not so Nazism. The contrast between Euro-

peanism and Americanism, as dispassionately set forth in this book, should inspire the doubting with new appreciation of our Constitution.

*Here Comes Labor* is a book well worth reading. It contains the long sought for clear explanation of the structure and set-up of the various unions under the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. It also explains the enduring tiff and rift between the leaders of the two organizations. Reviewing New Deal labor laws it weighs their relative advantages and dangers. N.L.R.B. is accused of favoritism, C.I.O. of harboring Communists. One can confidently recommend this book to libraries and study clubs.

*They Worked for a Better World* contains short biographies of Roger Williams, Thomas Paine, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Edward Bellamy. Paine is absolved of atheism; a great ado is made over the socialistic character of Bellamy's novel, *Looking Backward*; while Mrs. Stanton emerges as a pioneer feminist. The enthusiasm of the author for his chosen heroes is often strong, but seldom contagious. GEORGE T. EBERLE

JUSTLY DEAR. By E. Thornton Cook. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50

INTRODUCING Charles Lamb and his coterie of intimates, *Justly Dear* is another biographical novel by an author who has succeeded rather well with the same type of book on the Brontës and the Carlyles; and, should it meet the tyro's eye, will serve as a pleasant introduction to one of the most interesting literary circles that ever flourished. "Col" is there of course, enthraling the audience at the Salutation and Cat; and Wordsworth and his "enchanted sister"; and Haydon full of those newly imported Elgin marbles; and all the rest. Captain Burney drops in for a hand of whist just at the "wishing time" of the evening, and encounters the original of Mrs. Battle; and dear Mary lays out an impromptu supper of cold mutton while the genial little host, as Hazlitt said, "blurts out the finest wit and sense in the world."

Veteran Elians will prefer their literature straight, going directly to the Essays and Letters themselves, to the Crabb Robinson Diaries and other contemporary writings, and will not quite like to see "Saint" Charles in a "biographical novel," however sympathetically done: it is somehow unbecoming to jostle the great dead on their pedestals. Still Miss Cook is thoroughly conversant with all the extensive source material and has woven her *mélange* skilfully. PAULA KURTH

THE AMERICANA ANNUAL. AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CURRENT EVENTS, 1939. Edited by A. H. McDannald. Americana Corporation. \$10

IT is obviously unfair to estimate any secular encyclopedia by the attention it gives to Catholic affairs. At the same time there is some satisfaction in noting that the *Americana* has very sensibly handed some of its Catholic topics to Catholic experts. So that the Catholic Church is handled by Father Malloy of the Paulists, the N.C.W.C. by Charles A. McMahon, and the highly sensitive topic of Motion Pictures by the *Commonweal's* critic.

All told, there are 832 pages in this annual—not a great deal of space. But much has been crowded into that space, and it appears to be quite satisfactory. In the sections devoted to different countries, trouble has been taken to secure accurate figures on the religious position. There is a list of universities and colleges in the United States and Canada, to which is attached a deal of valuable information. But curiously enough there is nothing on Communism; even the article on Russia says very little about that.

Contributors to this annual appear to have gone to some trouble to be quite fair, and nobody seems to have an ax to grind. The paper is good, the letterpress clear, and the binding is of that useful quality which lets a book stay open at the page the reader is consulting. Altogether a volume to be welcomed! WILLIAM HENRY



IT IS one of the mysteries of history why a given period should be especially fertile in fine works of art in a given country or region while whole centuries can pass and nothing out of the ordinary will appear in the very same place. I do not refer to such phenomena as the disappearance of a civilization because of war or climatic change or pestilence. I am thinking rather of a country like the Netherlands. For a little over a century she produced truly great works of art. From the birth of Hals to the death of Hobbema is a little over 120 years; that century or so saw the birth, flowering and death of the greatest in Dutch art.

There have been all sorts of explanations of the phenomenon. There are those who hold that commercial prosperity is the prime reason for a resurgence of the arts; others prefer the notion that the infiltration of new blood or a new cultural strain accomplishes the same purpose. These latter notions are largely used to explain the Italian renaissance—the new blood being Germanic and the new culture being particularly that of Greece, released by the fall of Byzantium. Yet, somehow, these explanations are not adequate, or only in part. It is true that commercial prosperity is a *sine qua non*; if a civilization is always being threatened by some economic wolf, there will be no time for painting or sculpture, and no money with which to buy them, although here there is a large element of the relative. The culture of Tibet, for example, is far more poverty-stricken, and probably always has been, than anything we have known in the West, yet its prosperity in relation to its wants is such as to have produced a considerable and respectable body of art. And we cannot for an instant say that prosperity automatically produces art; there have been many prosperous periods which have been artistically sterile.

The stimulus which comes from a mixture of new blood or the introduction of new cultural patterns certainly is likely to lead to a flowering of all forms of intellectual expression, but it does not necessarily do so. It may lead to degeneracy of what already exists. Nor is it fair to point out what is true, that no artistic flowering ever springs into being without previous history. Hals was not the first painter of the Netherlands, any more than Giotto was the first painter in Italy. In fact one could probably show that at no time, even during the height of the Barbarian invasions, was Italy without painting of some kind. But all that does not explain why Giotto came into being to be followed by scores of first-rate artists and then, after 250 years, the great talent, with rare exceptions, suddenly seems to have died out of the race.

These idle reflections were occasioned by the publication of a book and by the literally lavish amount of art offered for the inspection of New Yorkers and their guests this summer. The book is one of those irritating mixtures of good and bad. It is called *Paintings on Parade* and was put together by a certain Donald Jenks. Mr. Jenks has written thumb-nail sketches of 163 artists and reproduces (with a sentence or two of criticism or appreciation) 302 paintings.

The short introductions to the chapters and the thumb-nail sketches of the artists are fairly good; the little tags to the pictures are uniformly bad. Naturally the reproductions are not of the very highest quality—they are small and sometimes poorly printed. But the worst thing in the whole book is the American section (though there are some rather inexplicable omissions in the French). The judgment that Copley "improved" after he went to England is preposterous; the omission of such an artist as Albert Ryder is beyond belief. But on the whole, *Paintings on Parade* is a valuable piece of work for the beginner.

HARRY LORIN BINSSE

SUSANNA, DON'T YOU CRY. The productions of the new American Lyric Theatre group at the Martin Beck Theatre were beyond question the most interesting of New York's spring theatrical offerings. They did not remain with us long, but it was definitely announced that this was because of the general depression in the theatrical business and that they would be with us again this coming autumn. They deserve recording here because of their unusual originality.

The first production, *The Devil and Daniel Webster*, has already been reviewed in this column. It was the last word in modernity as to music and presentation. The second offering, *Susanna, Don't You Cry*, went to the opposite extreme and swung us almost a century into the past, giving us a score made up wholly of Stephen Foster's melodies, and throwing in an old-time saccharine love story, written by Sarah Newmeyer and Clarence Loomis. In its different way *Susanna* was as unexpected as *The Devil and Daniel Webster*, and it was as new to modern eyes. The grandfathers and grandmothers in the audience loved it, but it is certainly fifty or sixty years since they have seen anything like it.

We had the villain, the languishing maid, the noble young lover, the old Kentucky home, and its plantation songs. For good measure, we had the ghost of Stephen Foster himself. He appeared twice in the offering—once as the live composer, the next time as his ghost. Living and dead he took an interest in the heroine's love affairs, helping to save her from the villain in the first episode, and returning years later, as a ghost, to save her again. He was a nondescript young man in both appearances. Even his piano playing of his own songs did not greatly help matters much though the music appeared to have a softening effect on the girl. She was, as a matter of fact, too soft without his music; for she had run away from her happy Kentucky home in the beginning of the romance to follow a worthless libertine; and when Stephen Foster had to return from his grave to help her out of her next mess, she was on the eve of throwing over a perfectly good husband.

None of this was any part of the real attraction *Susanna* had for the old-timers in the audience. What they liked was the score, with the lilting Foster melodies rippling through it, and the lovely background of the old Kentucky plantation, and the singing and dancing of the slaves. Most of all they liked three numbers by Avis Andrews—"Lemuel," "Angeline" and "Louisiana Belle," which had enough dash and go in them to electrify an entire production. These gay little crafts on the broad river of the ever flowing Foster music were really charming bits. Even the blasé ultra-moderns enjoyed them.

There was also the Hall Johnson Choir to help the good work along. Another number that made a hit was an old-fashioned minstrel show, for which Hans Spialek had the credit. Robert Edmond Jones designed, lighted and directed the production. May Valentine kept the members of the chorus up on their toes, Bettina Hall and Michael Bartlett sang the leading rôles, and the League of Composers helped in some way, nobody knows just how. The point is that *Susanna* made a hit with the old folks, and with the younger groups who are not too weary to be interested in the goings on and simple enjoyments of their ancestors.

It was pleasant to hear the Martin Beck echo with the melodies that were written almost a century ago—"Under the Willows She's Sleeping," "The Voice of Bygone Days," "Come Where My Love Lies Dreaming," "My Old Kentucky Home," "Soft Be Thy Slumbers," and more than a score of others almost as well known. Not all the sentiment in *Susanna, Don't You Cry* was on the stage of the Martin Beck. ELIZABETH JORDAN

## FILMS

**FIVE CAME BACK.** The high flush of melodrama is softened considerably in this tale of terror in the jungle by the simple expedient of developing the characters above the eyebrows. The incredibility which attaches to melodrama is not traceable so much to the outrageously exciting adventures as to the outrageously dull people to whom they happen, and it is because this film treats with persons rather than types that its story draws fresh interest. To be sure it is not the last word in literate entertainment but it does mark an improvement. A plane en route to Panama City is grounded in head-hunter country and when repairs are made it is discovered that the machine will carry only half the passengers to safety. The decision as to who shall stay behind falls to a man wanted for murder and director John Farrow makes the most of his dramatic situation. The threat of death charges the action with tenseness which is nicely controlled for suspense. Chester Morris, Joseph Calleia, Lucille Ball, Wendy Barrie, John Carradine and C. Aubrey Smith present a varied milieu and the picture reaches a good adult level. (RKO)

**MAISIE.** If anyone thought that the West was the last stand of completely wholesome entertainment that opinion will have to be qualified in the future, for in this brassy film the cowboy drawl is mingled with the suggestive patter of a triangle plot and the shooting is replaced by a suicide. Director Edwin Marin has pointed lines with an echoing leer, and the accent throughout is on raciness. A showgirl stranded in Wyoming insinuates herself into a job on a ranch and tries to provoke the manager to a proposal. Meanwhile the owner, discovering his wife's infidelity, commits suicide, and suspicion falls on the foreman, only to be dissolved by the showgirl in a courtroom scene. Robert Young and Ann Sothorn are supported by Ian Hunter, Ruth Hussey and Cliff Edwards. The humor of the piece consists of cheap verbalisms and innuendo. This is *weak stuff morally and cinematically*. (MGM)

**TARZAN FINDS A SON.** Although the noisy adventures of Edgar Rice Burrough's throwback hero have elicited nothing but snickers even from intellectuals who like, in a more scholarly atmosphere, to study man through the ape, there is a certain excellence of showmanship in this film. It differs from its predecessors in restraint, and while it still skirts plausibility by a wide margin, it does not invite hilarity. Studio approximations of the jungle and its denizens are artful in photography and curiosity value. Tarzan and his mate rescue a baby from an airplane crackup and raise him in a state of nature until the appearance of an unscrupulous pair with designs on the boy's English inheritance. On a trip through the wilds the party is captured by hostile natives and then it is Tarzan to the rescue with a herd of elephants. Johnny Weissmuller and Maureen O'Sullivan do well by their familiar rôles, and young John Sheffield is the pawn sought by Ian Hunter and Frieda Inescourt. This is *obvious entertainment*, but it will reward the unsophisticated. (MGM)

**INSIDE INFORMATION.** The old order changes not without a struggle in this yarn about crime from the policeman's viewpoint. The conflict is not so much between the law and the underworld as it is between the practical but unimaginative methods of the cop who rose from the ranks, and the scientific approach of a school-trained rookie, exercised on a jewel robbery. Dick Foran and Harry Carey are the law while June Lang adds the leaven of romance to a somewhat factual and expository picture which *younger audiences* will enjoy. (Universal)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

## EVENTS

THE oft-expressed belief that most people are not close observers was confirmed by the latest eruptions of current history. . . . A Bronx push-cart pusher did not notice a red traffic light, was fined two dollars for driving his hand-truck past the light. . . . A Midwesterner, bending over to pick up a baseball, did not observe a trolley truck backing up toward him until after the collision. . . . False teeth bit into the news. . . . A long passenger train stopped, commenced going backwards to the spot where the fireman had dropped his store molars. With these once more in the fireman's mouth, the train chugged on. . . . At the San Francisco Fair, a set of false teeth was found in front of a hamburger stand. . . . The type of person who likes to take long thought before proceeding to action was glimpsed in Tennessee. A woman there found an umbrella in a trolley car twenty-five years ago. Last week she returned it to the street-car company, asked them to find the owner. . . . On the other hand, the impulsive type which takes little or no thought was likewise discerned. . . . A California youth, presented with a new lasso, tried to lasso a fast-moving freight train. Hospital attaches believed he would survive. . . . Parental love was exemplified. . . . A Southwestern woman bequeathed to her two daughters "my sunny disposition, my sense of fairness and my beautiful neck." She also left them \$4,000. Catty neighbors said the \$4,000 was what interested the daughters most. . . . Important judicial decisions were handed down. . . . A New York court ruled that use of profanity over the telephone does not constitute disorderly conduct. . . .

A stirring conquest of environmental handicaps was disclosed when a black alley cat named Butch won first prize in a New York pet show. Butch was born and raised in a non-slum-clearance alley; had none of the advantages possessed by Junior League cats. . . . The inflexible will that resolutely faces handicaps other than environmental was also disclosed. . . . An 800-pound bale of paper fell on a Philadelphia rag-shop owner's head, just as he was recovering from three broken ribs sustained when an automobile ran over him. All this occurred a short time before a weight fell on his leg and broke it. It occurred also prior to the three fires which licked his rag shop. Despite these handicaps he refused to give up carrying on. . . . A Batavia, N. Y., man drove his auto into a speeding express train. Minus an auto, he later stepped inadvertently into an open elevator shaft, did not break both arms and legs, only one of each. In the face of these annoying incidents, he has not lost his smile, only his auto and the use of a couple of limbs. . . . Britain was reported as about to call for volunteers to test out the new air-raid shelters and ascertain if they are bomb-proof. All these men will have to do is to sit inside the shelters while bombs are exploded nearby. Nothing else is to be asked of them. . . . For inability to pay fines, two brothers and a cousin named Ice were sent to the cooler. . . . Rather than come empty-handed out of a store he had broken into, a New York burglar stole the only things that seemed available, two bottles of ketchup. Arrested, he will go to jail for ketchup. . . .

The question whether our penological system was not too harsh arose with explosive force, when a prison in Kansas forbade the convicts to wear silk underwear. A violent mutiny ensued. Prisoners characterized the order as inhuman, said men were being driven "stir-crazy" for lack of dainty underthings. . . . The accusation that an insufficient supply of radios is furnished convicts was also made.

THE PARADER